



**PASTOR
MARK BURNS**
**THE MAN WHO RESTORED
MY FAITH**

ELIZAVETA KHROMOVA

PASTOR MARK BURNS
THE MAN WHO RESTORED
MY FAITH

Elizaveta Khromova

Contents

Prologue	2
Introduction	3
Chapter 1	5
Chapter 2	11
Chapter 3	17
Chapter 4	26
Chapter 5	51
Chapter 6	76
Chapter 7	99
References	125

Prologue

Dedicated to the Man with a capital “M” — Pastor Mark Burns.

I begin this book with words of profound gratitude to a man I never had the honor of meeting in person, yet who became the very voice that returned light to me in the darkest period of my life. At that time, it felt as if everything was collapsing; when you lose not only your homeland, your home, and the work of your life, but even hope itself and faith. His name is Pastor Mark Burns, and his voice managed to break through the dense veil of despair, disillusionment, and pain that had enveloped my soul.

His words reminded me that even a single person, filled with active love and strength of spirit, can ignite hope and faith in others.

His ministry is a living testimony that even today, two thousand years later, there are still people who, following the example of Christ, continue to sow throughout the world that same singular seed once entrusted by Christ to His apostles. That seed — love, compassion, and reverence for human life — was and remains the greatest gift ever given to all of humanity.

As long as even one such voice is heard, faith and hope retain their power. And for me, that voice was Mark Burns.

This book is my path back to faith, hope, and dreams, despite all the hardships, trials, and deprivations of life.

With gratitude to Pastor Mark Burns!

Introduction

Sometimes light comes not when you seek it, but when you have already stopped expecting it. When it seems that ahead lies only cold and darkness, and everything that once was your foundation has turned to dust. It was in such a moment that a man entered my life whose name is now forever woven into my destiny — Pastor Mark Burns. I speak this name with the same reverence and gratitude one feels for someone who has saved one's life. Because that is precisely what happened.

To understand the scale and meaning of this turning point in my life, one must see the road that led to it — a road through trials and through the abyss of despair in which I once found myself.

When I decided to write this book, I knew it would hold many painful memories. But confession does not tolerate silence. Its strength lies in sincerity and honesty — qualities that have the power to heal.

From an early age, science shaped my perspective on the world, and my life gradually took shape along that path — from a child's fascination with geology to a professional career in geophysics. I have always viewed my research as a form of service for the good of others. Together with my colleagues, friends, and fellow volunteers from the international movement ALLATRA, we conducted interdisciplinary research, seeking real solutions to make the world safer and more resilient amid the planet's rapid changes in geodynamics.

We never confined science to theory: we sought to inform the public and relevant institutions about real planetary threats and the processes that could affect the fate of millions.

But that very openness became the reason for the blow that followed. The truth we spoke ran counter to the interests of powerful private groups for whom a potential geological catastrophe in Siberia seemed less dangerous than the loss of profit. Thus began a planned campaign of discrediting — an avalanche of lies, distortions, and media attacks.

We found ourselves in a reality where truth seemed powerless and falsehood omnipotent; where people's good names were dragged through

the mud, and faith in humanity was tested to its core. Those were days when the world appeared orphaned and silent, as if God were no longer in it, and ahead lay only impenetrable darkness.

I held on to the few things that still gave warmth — the support of family, the kind words of friends, and the quiet acts of humanity that reminded me goodness still existed. These people stood beside me, keeping me from falling entirely into the abyss of despair. Yet even their warmth could no longer dispel the inner darkness where faith, meaning, and the future had all but vanished.

And then, at the very moment when everything seemed darkest, when I had stopped expecting anything at all, light suddenly entered my life. It came from where I least expected — through a man I had never met, yet whose words filled my life with meaning. Pastor Mark Burns became the one who brought a quiet but genuine miracle into my life — the miracle of renewed faith.

Chapter 1

I grew up in an educated family where conversations about scientific and technological breakthroughs never ceased — not at the dinner table, not in the hallways, where the walls seemed to preserve the echo of formulas, debates over the laws of physics, and discussions of geological processes. Scientific arguments did not stop even at holiday feasts.

The words “science” and “benefit for humanity” were never abstract ideals borrowed from newspaper articles or fleeting speeches. These notions were the very air we breathed, the unshakable foundation upon which not only the life of our family was built, but also the inner world I came to form. At times, it seemed I was not so much taught these values as I absorbed them with my mother’s milk, with the scent of old books, with the bright stillness of long winter evenings spent in shared reading. While ordinary children were read fairy tales, from my earliest years, I was drawn to something else entirely. Before I even knew how to read, I would ask my mother to tell me about the mysteries of the Universe, about distant planets, about space, and the laws of nature.

Stories about Earth fascinated me most of all — about this planet whose depths hold the memory of billions of years, where forgotten epochs slumber beneath layers of rock, and where every stone is a letter from the distant past. I loved to hear how the secrets of ancient continents are preserved in the planet’s depths, how mountains were born and volcanoes raged, why the ground suddenly trembles, and how the silent witnesses of vanished worlds can be read in the fossilized remains of once-living creatures.

I needed precise answers that could explain everything, and the unresolved questions of science would not let me rest. Even as a child, nothing stirred my sense of wonder more than two kinds of people: geophysicists, who could perceive processes unfolding deep beneath our feet, down to the very core of the Earth; and astronomers, who could see objects scattered across the boundless expanse of the Universe.

From an early age, I dreamed that one day I would grow up and uncover every mystery — from the nature of gravity to the structure of black holes, and most of all, the secrets of our planet.

That is why my path into science was neither the result of a difficult choice nor a chance turn of events. It was as inevitable as a mighty river seeking its course, always finding its way, and eventually pouring into the sea.

Science, for me, was not merely a vocation but a destiny — an honest road one cannot walk half-heartedly.

When I became a geologist and geophysicist by profession, I immersed myself entirely in a world of immutable laws and indisputable facts, and my natural bent for observation only grew stronger. As a graduate student in geology, I placed deep trust only in what could be measured, calculated, and plotted on a graph. It seemed that everything in existence could be explained through the language of numbers and the laws of physics. The world appeared to me as a perfectly constructed system, where chaos reigned on the surface, but beneath it lay a strict, almost musical harmony.

The language of seismograms, gravimagnetic anomalies, and borehole data was clearer and closer to me than the evasive speeches of politicians, the solemn promises, or the ornate sermons of priests I occasionally happened to hear. In the Earth's depths, in the movements of lithospheric plates, in the breath of volcanoes, I did not see chaos but a complex, harmonious dance of forces governed by mathematical logic. That logic gave me a sense of stability, meaning, and the unshakable order of the Universe.

It was my genuine pursuit of truth, which had driven me since childhood and remained the foundation of my scientific journey, together with a desire to serve something greater than personal interests, that eventually led me to the international volunteer community known as ALLATRA.

The origins of this unique movement go back to the mid-1990s. At that time, a group of scientists — representing fields as diverse as physics, medicine, geology, and cosmology — joined their efforts to respond to the new challenges of the era. Already then, they were conducting comprehensive interdisciplinary research covering a wide range of issues, including the study of climatic and geodynamic changes on the planet.

The uniqueness of this scientific collective lay in its remarkable innovation and foresight — in its ability to perceive and begin exploring processes that only decades later would draw the attention of the global scientific community and be recognized as significant. They were not merely ahead of their time; they seemed to see the future of science itself, discerning which questions would become critically important for humanity twenty or thirty years later. Their approach to climate change, geodynamics, ecology, and the interconnections within natural systems held insights that could only have been reached through a fundamentally different perspective on science — one that was not confined within the boundaries of narrow specializations.

The understanding of science among the ALLATRA scientists was never superficial or formal: for them, science was always evidence-based, never speculative. They did more than exchange data across disciplines — they created fundamentally new research methods that made it possible to study phenomena in their fullness and complexity. Mathematical models were combined with field observations; laboratory experiments were linked with demonstrations of theoretical principles under controlled conditions; and ancient chronicles, which preserved vital knowledge of the past, were integrated with the discovery of new principles and possibilities in physics.

It was precisely this multifaceted approach and the open, egalitarian format of dialogue that allowed them to discern hidden patterns invisible at first glance within the seeming chaos of fragmented data split apart by narrow specializations. This kind of scientific approach enabled them to construct the most complete and objective picture of the phenomena under analysis.

They came to understand that processes in the Earth's crust are connected with cosmic cycles; that changes in the intensity of the Earth's magnetic field pose threats to the biosphere; that plastic particles exert a destructive influence on the electromagnetic field; and that everything in nature is far more interconnected than conventional academic science usually acknowledges.

Most importantly, their work was imbued with the conviction that science must serve life, not careers or prestige. Every study, every

conclusion, was viewed through the lens of two questions: “How will this help people? How will this protect future generations?” They did not work for scientific journals, grants, or titles — they worked for the survival of humanity on this planet.

It was this very motivation that allowed them to see further and deeper. When your task is not to publish an article but to discover the truth that may save lives, you begin to ask the right questions. When you understand that your conclusions may determine your own fate and the fate of your children and grandchildren, you cannot permit yourself superficiality or conformity.

Hypotheses were marked honestly — whether they were experimental results, working versions, or bold conjectures — yet the direction always remained the same: to find answers to humanity’s fundamental questions of survival and to understand the natural processes that may hold the key to overcoming global challenges.

When I first learned about the work of this scientific collective, I was struck not only by the insight of these people but also by their moral stance. They chose the path of genuine service — not to power, not to money, not to fame, but to humanity itself. And perhaps it was precisely this purity of intent that gave them that exceptional clarity of vision, enabling them to look so far ahead in science and to advance beyond their time.

Gradually, people who cared about these challenges — volunteers and like-minded individuals from dozens of countries — began joining this initiative. In this way, the broad International Volunteer Movement ALLATRA was born. And one day, I too found myself among them.

Here, no one asked where you came from, what nationality you were, what political views you held, or what you believed in. Only one thing mattered — our shared determination to unite our efforts in the face of global challenges, the foremost of which, even then, was the rapidly escalating geodynamic crisis threatening life on Earth.

It was a completely unique spirit of cooperation, where people were joined not by career or fame, but by a sincere resolve to help one another for the sake of a common future, by a willingness to work toward a shared

goal, where each person contributed what they could to the future of all humanity.

Within this community, I found my place. My knowledge proved essential for analytical work connected to the international study of Earth's climatic and geodynamic changes.

My role as head of the Information and Analytics Department on Global Climate Change did not imply hierarchical superiority, but rather a greater responsibility for coordinating the work of an international team of volunteer analysts.

Our work focused on global monitoring of natural disasters, analyzing seismic and volcanic activity, conducting comprehensive studies of changes in Earth's geodynamics, and informing people about the true scale of intensifying natural catastrophes.

We worked as a single organism: streams of data from all over the world — reports from seismic stations, bulletins from volcanological observatories, maps of ocean temperature anomalies — became our shared field of analysis. The monitors before us were windows into the beating, restless heart of the planet.

I saw my task as being that of an impartial analyst, someone who gathered scattered fragments of a vast mosaic — from an earthquake in Chile to the eruption of a volcano in Indonesia, from the anomalous drift of the magnetic poles to amplitude variations in the Schumann resonance — and pieced them together into one coherent picture. I systematized, compared, and searched for correlations and patterns so that the overall panorama of threats would become clear to everyone.

This was work filled with a quiet yet profound faith in knowledge as the driving force of science directed toward the good of humanity. That faith was grounded in the conviction that once we recognized and fully comprehended the danger looming over our common home, we no longer had the right to remain silent. Both professional and human duty required that we speak openly about it, bringing into the search for solutions not only the scientific community but all those who care about the future of humankind.

Facts presented honestly and openly seemed to us a force capable of awakening people's consciousness and uniting them in the search for solutions. I believed there was nothing more convincing than numbers and graphs, nothing more important than warning humanity in time.

Back then, I still believed that truth carried its own power, that truth needed no protection and would always prevail.

At that time, I did not yet know that in the human world, there are forces for which truth is more dangerous than any element, and that the wall they erect in its path can prove stronger than the Earth's own crust.

Chapter 2

For most people, Siberia is synonymous with endless taiga, harsh frosts, and immense natural wealth. For us, geologists and geophysicists of the Movement, it is first and foremost a place of colossal geological tension — a ticking magmatic bomb deep within the planet.

In the Analytical Department of ALLATRA, my colleagues from different countries and I kept our fingers on the pulse of this vast region for years. One of the epicenters of our research, and our most significant concern, was the territory where, approximately 250 million years ago, one of the greatest catastrophes in the planet's history took place. At the boundary of the Permian and Triassic periods, when the Paleozoic era gave way to the Mesozoic, massive eruptions of the Siberian Traps unfolded — countless basalt flows. The very crust of the Earth split open, covering an area comparable in size to Europe with lava. In the geological record, this boundary is marked by a dark line — evidence of the greatest mass extinction Earth has ever endured.

The cause of those catastrophic outpourings was the Siberian magma plume — a so-called superplume that rose toward the surface around 250 million years ago and burned through the crust. It was in this part of the planet that the research of the ALLATRA scientific collective in the early 2000s detected unusual geophysical and magmatic activity. The conclusions were shocking: the Siberian magma plume is still alive within the Earth's depths.

When we hear about lava eruptions, the imagination usually conjures up the classic cone of a volcano — Vesuvius, Etna, or Fuji. But what lies beneath Siberia cannot be compared to these phenomena, formidable though they are, yet still local in scale. Suppose an ordinary volcano is like a pinprick in the body of the planet. In that case, the Siberian superplume is a gaping wound capable of striking entire continents.

This is not a volcano in the usual sense, but a colossal, ascending stream of molten magma rising from the Earth's deepest layers toward the surface and spreading beneath Siberia like an immense underground river. The scale of its influence is of an entirely different order — if the

eruption of Vesuvius destroyed several cities, the activity of a superplume could poison the atmosphere and oceans, wipe entire ecosystems from the face of the Earth, and trigger a volcanic hyper-winter.

Imagine a region in Siberia the size of Australia, where energy seethes with the potential to burn straight through a lithospheric plate and unleash a planetary-scale catastrophe. This very territory, which holds within its depths the memory of an ancient apocalypse and the potential for a new one, became one of the central focuses of our research and our greatest concern. We understood: what once happened at the boundary of the Paleozoic and Mesozoic eras could happen again. The eruptions that could occur here in Siberia are comparable in their volume of volcanic emissions to the simultaneous salvo of one thousand of the most powerful Yellowstone eruptions.

We knew what was neither printed in newspapers nor spoken of on the evening news. We were aware of the awakening of the Siberian superplume. This was not a guess or a hypothesis. Thanks to the unprecedented unification of scientists from different countries, we possessed a comprehensive picture based on the analysis of an immense volume of data. But what had triggered the awakening of the Siberian magmatic giant?

It all began in 1995, when the planet started to show signs of a deep systemic breakdown. Anomalies in the Earth's fundamental parameters — from its rotation to its magnetic field — all pointed to one thing: something had changed dramatically at the very heart of the planet. Scientists recorded a sudden destabilization of the Earth's core — an event so vast that its consequences reverberated throughout the entire planetary system.

Imagine the core of our planet as a giant reactor that has been operating in a stable mode for the last 12,000 years. Suddenly, that reactor begins receiving additional energy — as if someone abruptly increased the fuel supply. That is precisely what we were observing: a sharp rise in the energetic activity of the Earth's outer core, which set off a cascade of changes across all the geospheres of the planet.

An interdisciplinary analysis of ancient deposits — the stone chronicles that preserve the memory of past catastrophes — revealed

a striking pattern. Such energy surges within the Earth do not occur randomly. They follow a strict astronomical cycle, repeating every 12,000 years, like a vast cosmic clock counting down to planetary disasters.

The cause of this cyclicity is of an astronomical nature. Some external cosmic process “recharges” the planet’s core every 12,000 years, directing colossal amounts of energy toward it. The hypothesis that the source of this energy lies beyond the Earth was convincingly supported by synchronous anomalies recorded on Mars and other planets of the Solar System, as though our entire stellar neighborhood had come under the influence of the same cosmic process.

For the Earth, the critical point of this cycle occurred in 1997–1998, when the planet’s inner solid core literally shifted within, making a physical leap, akin to a giant iron sphere losing its balance within its molten shell. This physical displacement of the planet’s solid iron heart, comparable in size to the Moon, became a turning point in the modern history of the Earth.

The activation of the Siberian magma plume occurred after the Earth’s core shifted abruptly in 1998 toward the Taymyr Peninsula, a region in the Siberian Arctic. This shift provoked a powerful upwelling of magma in that direction. As a result of these processes, an area comparable in size to an entire continent began to heat near the surface several times faster than the rest of the planet.

Another factor further aggravated the situation: in the course of our research, it became clear that the Earth’s natural cooling mechanisms had been disrupted. The cause lay in the pollution of the ocean and atmosphere with micro- and nanoplastics.

Nanoplastics, in particular, have become an anthropogenic factor that drastically reduces the thermal conductivity of ocean water. Heat that was once efficiently carried away from lithospheric plates by cold ocean currents was now accumulating in the planet’s interior. In the atmosphere, nanoplastics — possessing electret properties — created a kind of “blanket,” trapping excess energy in its lower layers.

The disruption of the Earth’s thermal balance, caused by human interference in its finely tuned energy systems — at a time when

the planet was already operating at its limits during the 12,000-year cycle — triggered intense magma melting. It was as though the ventilation of a giant furnace had suddenly been cut off: magma in the Earth's depths began to melt with unprecedented intensity.

And here emerged the great, inexplicable paradox that for many years was the subject of our silent, almost agonizing analysis. Scientific models predicted a natural inferno for the Siberian region as a result of the activation of the magmatic superplume, yet reality revealed the opposite.

By every law of physics, the region should have seen a dramatic increase in natural disasters, since air temperatures there were rising 2.5 to 3 times faster than the global average. Yet contrary to all projections, destructive events were scarcely recorded — the region maintained what could only be described as anomalous stability.

As analysts, we observed this anomaly in our daily data reports. It seemed as if some force was acting as a colossal shock absorber, smoothing out the most dangerous processes and keeping the system from slipping out of control. As it later became clear, this paradox did have an explanation. An explanation that for a long time was left unspoken — until the fateful year of 2023.

In August 2023, the Russian authorities declared the international public movement ALLATRA an undesirable organization, effectively banning its activities within the country.

On September 3, 2023, an event occurred that put everything into perspective. The brilliant scientist Igor Mikhailovich Danilov made a public statement on behalf of ALLATRA's inner scientific core, whose existence I had not been aware of until then. It was during this address that, for the first time, the essence of the so-called "Siberian miracle" was revealed.

He reported that because of the persecution and the direct threat of criminal prosecution against ALLATRA's scientists and volunteers, the operation of unique experimental equipment that had been functioning in Russia since 2013 was forcibly halted, and the equipment itself was dismantled and removed from the country.

This technology had, for ten years, temporarily disrupted the electromagnetic connections between the Earth's interior and the atmosphere in Siberia, preventing destructive energy from being released at the surface.

Later, it became clear to me that the contribution of the scientist Igor Danilov was truly colossal. His idea, brought to life through the efforts of an international research group, was the very factor that for an entire decade had held back destructive processes on a planetary scale.

Although the equipment was located directly in the plume's active zone, its influence extended far beyond the region, protecting billions of people and actively stabilizing the climate not only in Russia but also in Eastern Europe, China, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. Its indirect effects were felt even on other continents, including the United States.

It was an invisible shield that restrained not only local but also global climatic and geodynamic processes, exerting a stabilizing influence on the entire planet.

And then the shield was forcibly removed.

The scientists of ALLATRA's inner scientific core were forced to suspend their research and shut down the equipment in Siberia, because once the organization was declared undesirable, any further work risked placing critically important technologies under the control of forces working against humanity's interests.

The consequences were not long in coming. As Igor Danilov had warned, beginning in the autumn of 2023, the world witnessed bitter yet undeniable proof of this technology's effectiveness.

After the shutdown of the "damper," extreme natural events began to strike the regions: the "Storm of the Century" on the Black Sea coast, ice storms and snowfalls of abnormal intensity in Moscow, record frosts and catastrophic floods in Siberia and the Far East. Each month brought new climate records, turning the calendar into a chronicle of natural disasters — as if nature, once deprived of its restraining factor, had begun releasing its accumulated destructive energy.

All of this was accompanied by a sharp rise in economic losses caused by the aftermath of these disasters. And the damage was borne

not only by Russia, but also by other countries, including the states of Eastern Europe and regions of Asia, among them China.

This cascade of disasters was no accident. It was physics — the direct and tragic consequence of shutting down a system that, for ten years, had quietly served as a climate shield for the entire world.

For me, as an analyst, everything that unfolded became the most terrifying confirmation of the correctness of Igor Danilov and the ALLATRA scientific group. We were now witnessing the situation develop rapidly along the very model and scenario we had calculated earlier.

Each new bulletin of a flood, each report of a hurricane, was a reminder of a missed chance. And now we all stood as witnesses to how the political will of only a handful of people condemned all of humanity — billions of lives — to suffering in the future. The whisper that once rose from the planet's depths had turned into the roar of nature, which, like a wounded beast, lashed out with sudden catastrophic disasters across different regions of the Earth.

Chapter 3

This all-pervading roar and thunder of catastrophes shaking the planet echoes within me as a sharp, piercing pain. And it is not only about the fateful events of 2023, after which the geodynamical crisis became visibly more intense.

It is about an entire chain of events — a procession of unheard voices, underestimated threats, and wasted time. It all began more than a decade ago with the collision of two worlds: one in which irrefutable scientific facts and an ethical imperative prevail, and another in which truth serves merely as small change for the greater Lie in the struggle for money and power.

The tectonic shift, after which reality would never again be the same for many ALLATRA scientists, came in 2014. That was when a group of researchers, after many years of gathering and interdisciplinary analysis of data, prepared the report *On the Progression of Climatic Disasters on Earth and Their Catastrophic Consequences*, which became the quintessence of their work. The report was divided into two parts: a public edition, intended for a broad audience, and a confidential version, prepared for a select group of decision-makers.

It was in the confidential section of the report that the most alarming findings were presented — calculations indicating the activation of the magma plume in Siberia and the threat of its uncontrolled eruption. The scientists warned that these processes could lead to a global catastrophe, leaving humanity with almost no chance of survival. Their warnings were not exaggerations — they were supported by verified data and calculations obtained through comprehensive research. Aware of the magnitude of the potential threat, the authors of the report devoted particular attention to identifying practical ways of preventing it, including concrete engineering solutions that could avert disaster.

Foremost among these was the concept of controlled degassing — a program of planned and managed reduction of excess pressure, as well as the venting of gases and lava from secondary magma chambers of the Siberian plume to prevent an uncontrolled explosion. With a sound

approach, the risks of implementing such a project would have been minimal, while the potential benefit would have been extraordinarily significant. Planned degassing and pressure reduction in the Siberian plume could have become a lifesaving valve for the entire planet. It would not only have prevented a destructive eruption of the plume itself but also released tension across the whole planetary system, halting the avalanche of earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and climate catastrophes associated with the 12,000-year cycle.

Controlled degassing was seen by the group of scientists not only as a reliable, effective, and necessary measure to prevent catastrophe, but also as a way to gain time to search for fundamental solutions aimed at eliminating the root causes of the climate and geodynamic crisis — one of which was stripping nanoplastic of its electret properties. This measure was crucial in initiating the removal of excess thermal energy from the Earth's interior and restoring the planet's energy balance.

In presenting their findings to decision-makers, the scientists were convinced that if they provided a complete and maximally objective picture, supported by thousands of hours of analysis and cross-checking, the response would be rational and proportionate to the existing risks. All the more so because they had not only identified the problem but also proposed ways to solve it. With this rescue plan, they moved forward, holding their breath, hoping for common sense and for the mobilization of all resources to prevent disaster for the sake of humanity's survival.

They sincerely believed that truth — especially when it concerned the survival of the entire biosphere — was a universal value, an absolute before which any private interests would retreat. As it turned out, they were wrong.

Their hopes for reason and prudence were not fulfilled. They had not taken into account that alongside their world of rigorous analysis, scientific integrity, and moral duty existed a parallel universe governed by different rules — a place where two plus two did not equal four but whatever suited the interests of the powerful.

And when these two worlds collided, all of us volunteers at ALLATRA were forced to realize with bitterness that the financial interests of a few private individuals outweighed the future of all humanity. In the

proposed solution, the influential circles saw not a lifeline for people (including themselves and their loved ones) but a real threat to their own well-being, long-term plans, and forthcoming super-profits.

The reaction came swiftly. Since the scientific arguments were irrefutable and there was nothing they could rebut on substance, they chose a different path — to destroy the source of information that threatened their financial interests. Soon after, the scientists and all who dared to speak this truth openly were subjected to pressure, sustained discrediting, and persecution. We were slandered, trampled, and our reputations attacked so that none of our words would ever again be taken seriously.

Thus, instead of a scientific discussion about the future and the search for solutions to save the planet, we were branded as insane sectarian conspiracy theorists who believed in aliens and an impending apocalypse. We were punished for daring to place the life of humanity above someone's profits.

In this way, the scientific discussion was silenced before it had even begun, and the language of facts was replaced by the language of force, lies, and hatred.

The report that ALLATRA scientists delivered in the hope that measures would be taken to save people fell straight into the furnace of hostile interests. Truth had entered a place where it was clearly unwelcome — offices where destinies were ruled by cold calculation, and our voice was an intrusion. Very soon, we felt this in full measure.

No scientific rebuttals followed. Instead, in 2015, a coordinated campaign of discrediting was launched against ALLATRA through the Russian Association of Centers for Religious and Sect Studies (RACIRS). For the first time, we were branded a “sect,” and overnight turned into heretics of the twenty-first century. This label became the starting point for a systematic campaign of persecution and total defamation.

For me, as a scientist accustomed to operating with data, facts, and evidence, encountering this phenomenon was like confronting an unknown, irrational force. It was bewildering. The publications that appeared online were filled with absurd, baseless accusations that

contradicted not only the facts of our work but also common sense. They were constructed according to a single template: a flashy headline, the derogatory label “sect,” and a set of clichés with no real foundation.

Their goal was cynical and transparent: to cast the global community of scientists and volunteers in a false light and to destroy the source of scientifically verified information.

What was especially bitter to realize was that representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church took part in spreading slander about ALLATRA and in portraying us as “enemies of society” — even though, in my deepest conviction, it was they who should have stood on the side of truth and compassion for people.

I will not go into a detailed discussion of the ethical side of their involvement here. I will only note that the participation of Russian Orthodox Church officials in this persecution can largely be explained by their integration into RACIRS. This organization, calling itself secular, in fact unites nearly all the missionary centers of dioceses and affiliated structures, serving as the primary vehicle of the anti-cult agenda under the patronage of the Russian Orthodox Church and Russian security services.

The president of RACIRS is Russia’s “chief cult expert,” Alexander Dvorkin — a man with powerful administrative and media resources, closely tied to both state and church structures. Its vice-presidents are Russian Orthodox priests: Archpriest Alexander Novopashin and Archpriest Alexander Shabanov. On the website of the missionary department of the Novosibirsk diocese, headed by Alexander Novopashin, materials systematically appear that slander ALLATRA and its volunteers.

As for RACIRS itself, websites affiliated with the Russian Orthodox Church note that the association operates across the post-Soviet space. It is engaged not only in shaping “public opinion” — including through its own electronic and print media — but also in advising federal, regional, and municipal authorities, media outlets, and law enforcement agencies on issues of “sectarianism,” as well as conducting so-called “independent” expert reviews.

The best illustration of just how “impartial” RACIRS’s approach is, of the breadth of its list of “undesirables,” and of the real attitude toward Alexander Dvorkin’s ideas and his merciless campaign against “sects,” came from former RACIRS member, journalist Valery Otstavnykh, who knows the association’s inner workings well:

“Whatever organization you look at — it’s either a classic sect, or a destructive one, or a commercial cult. The approach lacked scientific rigor. And we began to tire of this rigid stance that everyone is bad, while we alone are pure and righteous.

Because people kept coming to us and asking: Please tell us, who in our country is NOT a sect? And then you start going through the list, maybe recall the Orthodox Old Believers... And that’s where the imagination ends” [1].

What more can be said — a truly universal tool for discrediting and suppressing any organization deemed undesirable, or any expression of dissent. And we experienced the full weight of this mechanism ourselves. The machine of discrediting, honed over decades on others, was turned against us at full force.

Through its network of controlled online portals and media outlets, a torrent of filth and lies poured down on us, without limit or restraint. Our names, professions, and even our very humanity were systematically erased, replaced with a poisonous label — “sectarian.”

Over the course of more than ten years of aggressive information campaigns against ALLATRA’s scientists and volunteers, thousands of publications and dozens of television segments were released in Russia, Ukraine, European countries, and even the United States — in other words, everywhere the tentacles of this transnational anti-cult network could reach.

Looking at this avalanche of lies and the scale of the smear campaign against honest scientists and volunteers, I cannot help but think: how many good deeds could have been done, how many people could have been helped, how much benefit could have been brought to society with the colossal resources and years that were instead spent on making us into enemies, on destroying human lives and destinies, on pushing the

entire world — themselves and their own families included — to the brink of survival in the face of unprecedented climate threats. Yet they continued to invest in the torrent of lies, which only grew, becoming ever more aggressive and coordinated.

My fellow volunteers and I often noted how the same false clichés and narratives appeared in unison, as if on command — first in Russian media, then in Ukrainian, and later in European outlets.

I will never forget the shock and bewilderment I felt when I opened yet another article in a European publication and saw a word-for-word translation of slander once conceived in the offices of RACIRS: the exact words, the same epithets, the same lies... Russia, Ukraine — and now Europe. All their supposed “objectivity” proved to be a farce. This was not journalism but a perfectly tuned and coordinated attack, where a template of falsehood was reproduced again and again, leaving no room for truth.

Perhaps the most grotesque example of the European media’s campaign against ALLATRA was the BBC article published on April 26, 2022. To my astonishment, I discovered that the BBC presented the opinion of the Chelyabinsk Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church as an authoritative source, directly quoting its missionary department, which is controlled by RACIRS. One of the authors of the defamatory article was revealed to be a journalist affiliated with the anti-cult “expert” Alexandra Stein, who, in turn, maintains close ties with Alexander Dvorkin. That BBC article effectively became the catalyst for a new, even more extensive wave of discrediting ALLATRA in democratic countries.

By the end of 2023, the wave of information attacks in Europe had intensified. Czech media took up the baton, with journalist Kristina Cirokova at the center, and Italian outlets followed, featuring commentary from Luigi Corvaglia, Alexander Dvorkin’s associate and close friend.

All of them tirelessly repeated narratives crafted in Russia — like broken records, glassy-eyed, reciting their memorized script about a “sect.” They stubbornly turned away from the very essence and depth of ALLATRA’s work.

The real scale of the organization’s activity was deliberately ignored by anti-cult journalists and “experts.” It seemed that the very possibility

of society seeing another reality frightened them far more than their own narrowness. None of them even attempted to tell the world that, in addition to deep scientific research in climate, geodynamic, and environmental risks, as well as studies on the growing threat of micro- and nanoplastic to the biosphere, ALLATRA's core directions include educational initiatives, public lectures and international forums, and the creation of documentary films that help millions of people see global problems in a new light. It also involves civic diplomacy, human rights work, and open, honest dialogue at the level of organizations such as the UN, UNESCO, leading universities worldwide (the Bolivian Catholic University of San Pablo, Bay Atlantic University, GPI), as well as religious centers, including the Vatican itself, and even governmental institutions.

A vivid acknowledgment of our mission came in the apostolic blessing of His Holiness Pope Francis, received in 2024, as well as the blessing of Pope Leo XIV, given in 2025 to the movement's president, Maryna Ovtynova, and to all the volunteers.

None of the anti-cult actors ever attempted to discuss the true motivation of ALLATRA's volunteers — the genuine moral and scientific responsibility to humanity, where the highest priority is always the human being, their life, and their rights. The limit of the persecutors' "talent" amounted to crude labeling with words like "sect" and "cult," while facts were ignored and truth deliberately concealed. And truth, which time and again disproved their accusations, was far too inconvenient for them.

As for the situation in Ukraine and Russia, the absurdity there reached its peak — producing a paradox worthy of the classics of literary nonsense. In two countries at war, standing on opposite sides of the barricades, volunteers of the organization faced mutually exclusive accusations at the very same time.

A truly paradoxical synergy! We were accused of state treason in favor of each other, using the same false clichés, with only the details adjusted to fit political circumstances: in Russia, the movement was brutally persecuted as "pro-Ukrainian" and "pro-Western," while in Ukraine and in the West, ALLATRA was accused of being a "pro-Russian sect."

My analytical mind resisted taking it seriously for a long time. What was happening seemed like an absurd misunderstanding, a cruel prank.

Everything changed when I stumbled upon a new batch of disturbing facts. It turned out that alongside the public discrediting, there was a synchronized and targeted fabrication of criminal cases against ALLATRA scientists and volunteers in both Russia and Ukraine — and in both countries, this was happening with the direct involvement of local anti-cult operatives.

Their method was monstrous and straightforward: first, an enemy image is created by branding people in the media, and then, once public opinion has been prepared, law enforcement steps in.

On both sides of the geopolitical divide, the same forces were at work. They spoke Russian with Moscow security officials and Ukrainian with Kyiv authorities just as easily. They operated from different positions, hid under different names, but their true nature remained unchanged: they all had the same heart — and it beat in rhythm with the obscurantism born in the shadowed offices of Russian “sectologists.”

Ultimately, the activities of these forces led to an unprecedented operation carried out by the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU) in November 2023: more than 70 searches across the country, raids on offices — all this the result of a criminal case initiated on fabricated charges based on pseudo-expert evaluations by anti-cult activist Iryna Kremenovska, who had repeatedly and publicly declared her involvement in this process.

In parallel, in Russia, the same campaign first resulted in the organization being declared undesirable in August 2023 and then escalated into a wave of inspections, searches, interrogations accompanied by torture and falsification of evidence, and the opening of cases on fabricated charges. I myself became one of the victims of this campaign. The peak of this persecution came in June 2025, when ALLATRA was officially designated an extremist organization in Russia. This decision effectively outlawed the movement altogether, paving the way for even harsher and more total repression against volunteers.

Looking back to 2015, at the first smear articles and the early attempts to brand ALLATRA's scientists and volunteers as a “sect,” I admit: at the time, I treated these attacks with irony — all their activity seemed to

me like empty noise and sheer stupidity, carried out by rather mediocre people. To me, a scientist whose world is built on logic, causality, and verifiable data, this stream of incoherent, irrational malice looked like feverish ravings and the product of someone's diseased imagination.

Yet very soon came a cold, sobering realization. Setting emotions aside, we did what we do best (I remind you, in ALLATRA I worked with some of the world's finest analysts): we applied our analytical tools and began to study the directors of this hatred, their structure, identifying the networks, channels of influence, and pathways by which this poisonous falsehood spread.

And then, with bitter clarity, we understood: behind what at first seemed like a chaotic outburst of spontaneous hatred lay a vast, merciless repressive machine for which human life, honor, and freedom held no value at all.

Chapter 4

The deeper one delves into studying the anti-cult network, the clearer the contours of a ruthless repressive machine emerge—one that has been methodically constructed over more than thirty years.

Its objectives were not limited to discrediting individual people or organizations. The agenda was far broader, intrinsically linked to destabilizing society, fueling intolerance and aggression, and undermining rights and freedoms.

At first glance, all their activities might appear to be a patchwork of scattered initiatives, a colorful mosaic of “experts,” foundations, and organizations dispersed across different countries. Yet step by step, a hidden architectonic structure began to reveal itself. This was not a random assortment of fragments but a unified network with the hallmarks of a well-coordinated system: a hierarchy, a central coordinating hub, standardized methods, and synchronized operations.

Its construction unfolded gradually, one stage after another. It began in 1993, when Alexander Dvorkin founded the “Information and Consultation Center in the Name of Saint Irenaeus of Lyons” in Russia. The next step came in 2006 with the establishment of the Russian Association of Centers for Religious and Sect Studies (RACIRS). Under Dvorkin’s leadership, this organization became the propagandist and ideological core of the entire anti-cult network.

Thus, at the very top of this transnational structure today stands RACIRS, headed by Alexander Dvorkin. His figure is the key to understanding the operation of this entire mechanism. Without him, the network would not have achieved such scale or stability.

The next tier of the anti-cult network became its European hub, FECRIS, the European Federation of Centres for Research and Information on Sectarianism. From 2009 to 2022, Dvorkin served as its vice president, which allowed him to directly export the Russian anti-cult agenda into Europe. The irony was that this was done at the expense of European taxpayers: about 90 percent of FECRIS’s budget was funded by the French government, giving the network an appearance of legitimacy and respectability.

Using its consultative status with the Council of Europe and the United Nations, FECRIS legitimized Russian anti-cult ideas on the international stage, lobbied for repressive laws in EU countries, organized conferences to coordinate actions, and provided an “expert platform” for discrediting targeted groups.

Through structures like FECRIS, the Russian anti-cult agenda infiltrated Europe and America without obstruction. It acquired a European façade and began to sound no longer like the private initiative of Dvorkin or RACIRS but like an “international expert opinion.”

At the bottom of this pyramid operated an army of national agents—“experts,” journalists, and activists working on the ground. In Ukraine—Iryna Kremenovska and Oleksii Sviatohor; in the Czech Republic—Jakub Jahl and Kristina Cirokova; in the United States—Steven Hassan and Dave Troy; in Italy—Luigi Corvaglia.

What was especially striking was how the network managed to harness resources from vastly different sources, including, paradoxically, those of geopolitical rivals. It drew on funds from Russian state structures, money from the French government (through FECRIS), and even resources from Western foundations such as USAID and the Open Society Foundations.

Dvorkin’s collaboration with USAID dated back many years. In one of his early interviews, he openly stated that in Russia, he had served as the project director of International Orthodox Christian Charities (IOCC), an organization that had been an official implementing partner of USAID for decades [2].

We, the volunteers of ALLATRA, experienced firsthand the absolute synchronicity and coordination of this network’s work. Anti-cult activists, living in different countries, speaking different languages, and funded from various sources, yet operated as a single entity: they employed identical rhetoric and methods, including the practice of cross-citing one another in the media. Each actor played their own part, but the entire script came from the same source.

The primary weapon of the anti-cult network was, without question, media exposure. Every campaign was designed to generate maximum resonance—whether through a “revelatory” article or news of a newly

launched criminal case. This was a calculated manipulation of public consciousness: synchronized waves of disinformation rolled in again and again, like a tsunami striking the same point.

The network's arsenal consistently employed the same markers: "sect," "cult," "psychocult," "brainwashing." The moment these labels appeared in the information space, an individual or group instantly became the target of public hatred.

Among these labels, a special place was reserved for the term "totalitarian sect." Dvorkin himself coined the term. Across the post-Soviet space, it became a universal tool for excluding any unwanted group from the legal and ethical sphere without trial or investigation. This could mean a social or commercial organization, an educational project, a new religious movement, priests within the Russian Orthodox Church, or any political or ideological opponent.

The choice of this phrase was no accident. Dvorkin skillfully played on two deep-seated fears of Russian society in the early 1990s: the fear of a Stalinist revival and the dread of chaos in the new reality.

This mechanism was most precisely described in a report by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF):

"At a seminar in 1993, he allegedly coined the term 'totalitarian sect,' a concept which effectively merged Western anti-cult ideas with the post-Soviet context, where anxiety about the return to the Stalinist past competed with fears about an unstable present. Totalitarian sects, Dvorkin explained, were 'authoritarian organizations whose leaders strive to dominate and exploit their followers' through various deceitful 'masks.' He has compared such leaders to Hitler and Lenin, equated religious communities with the Stalinist Gulag, and said that NRMs had more in common with totalitarian political regimes than 'real' religions like the ROC" [3].

What hypocrisy — to frighten people by comparing sect leaders to dictators like Hitler, while at the same time relying in his own activities on a methodology born in Nazi Germany. For today, the anti-cult network reproduces the very practices that once led to the tragedy of the Holocaust.

When I first learned about the origins of the anti-cult movement, a chill ran through me — it was the touch of something truly dark. I discovered that the rhetoric, operational methods, and instruments of the anti-cult network mirror Nazi practices of stigmatizing Jews and other minorities. Modern anti-cult centers are, in fact, institutional heirs of those structures that in Hitler's era supplied the Gestapo with information about religious minorities and dissidents. Then it led to concentration camps and mass executions; today, it has reemerged under a new façade, reviving the same mechanisms once again.

This continuity can be clearly traced. The chain extends from Pastor Walter Künneth, who headed the “Apologetic Center” and collaborated with the Gestapo, to his successor, Friedrich-Wilhelm Haack, in postwar Germany; from Haack to Johannes Aagaard, founder of the “Dialogue Center” in Denmark; and finally to his student, Alexander Dvorkin.

This lineage is terrifying in its continuity — from Nazi methodologists to modern anti-cultists. As a student of Aagaard and the official representative of his center in Russia, Dvorkin directly imported these technologies of stigmatization, pressure, and repression, modernized and expanded them, and effectively contributed to the revival of these practices in the twenty-first century.

In one interview, Dvorkin recalled how Professor Aagaard invited him to Denmark to become acquainted with the work of the Dialogue Center in Aarhus:

“For several years, I traveled to Denmark to attend events organized by the Dialogue Center, and each time I brought back a suitcase full of photocopied documents, which became the foundation of the archive for a similar organization in Russia — the Information and Consultation Center in the Name of Saint Irenaeus of Lyons” [4].

Thus, brick by brick, the foundation of the Russian anti-cult network was built. Its roots quite literally traced back to the archives of Nazi methodology that Dvorkin had brought from Europe in suitcases.

To understand the ideology of the anti-cult network, it is essential to examine its line of continuity — not only the institutions but also the

worldview of those who shaped it. Their beliefs, their attitude toward human rights, and their perception of freedom itself reveal that this network was built from the outset not on the values of protection and dialogue but on a drive for control and contempt for dissent.

Johannes Aagaard, Dvorkin's mentor, at first glance appeared to be a respectable Lutheran professor, theologian, and specialist in missionary work. In 1973, he founded the Dialogue Center. Formally, its mission was to study new religious movements and establish dialogue with them. Yet the deeper one examines the center's activities, the clearer it becomes that the word "dialogue" in its name was a fiction. In reality, it was an instrument for gathering compromising materials and compiling "blacklists," much like the Apologetic Center led by Walter Künneth during the rise of Nazism in Germany.

Equally revealing was Aagaard's own attitude toward fundamental principles of freedom. He openly mocked the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, calling it a "neurosis," and declared that it was unnatural to human nature [5].

Aagaard's mentor and inspiration was **Friedrich-Wilhelm Haack**. In 1964, he was appointed "Commissioner for Sect Affairs" in the Bavarian Church. Haack did not even conceal his disdain for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a document that became a moral vaccine against the horrors of Nazism and a symbol of unity and equality. Haack called it a mistake. In his writings, he proclaimed:

"If we understand our faith correctly, we do not have the right to allow the 'others' to continue in their faith..." [5].

But Haack himself created nothing new. He merely continued a line that had begun long before him. At the same university where he had studied, theology was later taught by Walter Künneth, an anti-Semite from Bavaria and editor-in-chief of the Protestant publication Word and Deed. In 1932, it was Künneth who headed the "Apologetics Center" of the Protestant Church of Germany, a structure that, in 1933, immediately after Hitler came to power, signed a cooperation agreement with the Gestapo and supplied both the Gestapo and Goebbels's Ministry of Propaganda with materials for the "fight against Jews" and "sects."

Künneth himself expressed satisfaction with the security services' interest in his work. In one of his reports to the Reich Church government, he wrote:

“The Gestapo expressed great interest in the Apologetics Center’s archive of sects and in our work against free thought, Marxism, and Bolshevism. The Gestapo expressed a desire to lead the fight against illegal free thought in the future, together with the Apologetics Center. The exchange of materials between the Gestapo and the Apologetics Center has already begun” [5].

These pseudo-expert reports and denunciations became part of the ideological groundwork that led to mass persecution and deportations to concentration camps. The “Apologetics Center” was not merely a passive informant — it served as the ideological justification for terror.

As I read those lines, a vivid image rose before my eyes: the apologists of the Third Reich writing denunciations, recording people’s names and addresses—and with that, signing their death sentences. It filled me with unbearable pain and horror to realize that this very methodology survived the war and is being revived in our time. A thread stretched from the depths of the past, running through the decades, still touches our lives today.

I felt that historical horror especially sharply when I read the recollections of Valerii Otsavnykh, a former member of RACIRS. Using the example of the Tula region, he described how RACIRS had become an indispensable “supplier of enemies” and a source of pseudo-expert opinions for the security agencies, particularly for the Centers for Countering Extremism:

“Now I’ll tell you a very interesting story... When, in 2011, the Directorate for Combating Organized Crime within the Ministry of Internal Affairs was dissolved, the famous slaughter division, remember? It was turned into the centers for countering extremism... At first, they desperately tried to find themselves a new target. They found it in nationalists. They somehow decided that the main threat to Russia was nationalists... But soon the nationalists ‘ran out’, there weren’t enough of them to satisfy reporting quotas. And then I remember the first time they came to our Missionary department... They came to us and openly said: ‘Guys, you know, we used to fight nationalists, but somehow they’ve run out, and now we’ve got no

one left to fight. We heard that you're also fighting, that's awesome, against some sort of scum, enemies of the state, sectarians. But we don't have any information about them. Could you share with us some information? Where, on what street, in which house, do the leaders of these destructive religious communities in the Tula region reside?' So my colleague, Aleksei, began cooperating with them. Or rather, the Missionary department did, through him" [6, 7].

I reread those words again and again. A state structure created to fight extremism was literally asking the “fighters against sects” for lists of people — names, addresses, phone numbers. Lists for law enforcement to knock on someone's door.

It is no surprise that RACIRS maintained such registers. This was not an accident, but a systematic method of operation, one that the anti-cult network's own representatives openly discussed. A characteristic example is the remark by Archpriest Dmitry Smirnov at the international online conference “Totalitarian Sects: The Threat of the 21st Century” (2001):

“Two people in any city can quite easily learn the addresses, surnames, given names, patronymics, and home addresses of the leaders of all existing sects. Well, you can make posters and photocopy them... and paste these posters all over government institutions. And you can photograph them as they leave their homes. So that every resident of the city knows them by sight, knows their name, patronymic, home address, and phone number. And you can add a fax and e-mail... And in a second stage, you can say what kind of sect it is, very briefly, in a telegram style. And I think for many, that will be enough to make them leave. At the very least, a brick or two will fly through that window...” [8].

I could not believe these words came from a priest of the Orthodox Church — a man who should have spoken of love and mercy. Instead, they sounded like a cold instruction on how to turn people into objects of a hunt.

What stayed with me most were his words, “paste these posters all over government institutions... so that every resident of the city knows them by sight.” The history grew darker before my eyes. Images of Nazi “shame exhibitions” surfaced — for example, the traveling exhibit

“The Eternal Jew,” staged by the National Socialists from November 1937 as part of the Third Reich’s antisemitic campaign. Police reports showed a direct connection between the exhibit and a rise in antisemitic attacks [9].

The monstrous mechanism was the same: first, the stigma — poster, exhibition; then, stones through windows, denunciations, arrests.

Over time, the statements of the anti-cult Orthodox priest, Archpriest Dmitry Smirnov, grew ever harsher — up to open, radicalized calls for persecution:

“Gather the people! Smash that sect! Go there, you understand? Go to the police! If they don’t act, go to the prosecutor’s office, you understand?.. We must make the ground burn under the feet of those scoundrels” [10].

When such calls come from the lips of a priest, they become a signal that violence is not only permissible but sanctioned “from above.” It becomes a kind of moral indulgence for the persecutors—a “blessing” for committing crimes.

These public statements and long-running discrediting campaigns, launched by the ideologists of the anti-cult movement, acted as catalysts for real pogroms, persecution, and harassment of “undesirable” groups and religious communities.

For instance, the rhetoric of Alexander Dvorkin, the leader of the anti-cult movement, toward Jehovah’s Witnesses, whom he has persecuted since 1993, effectively destroying freedom of religion in Russia, became the trigger for inciting hatred, smear campaigns, and subsequent repression against believers of this faith.

He used every possible form of propaganda against them: slanderous newspaper articles, online publications, lectures, and television appearances where he consistently portrayed believers in a profoundly negative light. Dvorkin’s widely publicized appearance on NTV in 2009, filled with offensive labels, provoked a campaign of harassment and a wave of violence against members of this religious group across the country. Believers were beaten and pushed down staircases; schoolchildren were bullied simply because their parents were Jehovah’s Witnesses; women were struck on the head and kicked in the back; prayer houses were set on fire, windows were smashed with stones, and Kingdom Halls were attacked with Molotov cocktails.

These incidents were documented by the SOVA Information and Analysis Center (including in its 2009–2010 reports). International organizations recorded numerous acts of violence and vandalism, and the U.S. Department of State, in its reports on religious freedom, expressed deep concern over what was happening in Russia.

I could hardly read these accounts without shuddering. Behind each of them was someone's pain, a broken life, fear entering the homes of defenseless people. Among the victims of Dvorkin's anti-cult campaign were the elderly, women, children—ordinary, peaceful people forced to endure humiliation and violence simply because they had been branded “sectarians” and stripped of their right to be seen as human.

Over time, this hatred evolved into large-scale state persecution. In 2017, the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation declared the “Administrative Center of Jehovah's Witnesses” an extremist organization, liquidated hundreds of congregations, and set off a wave of mass searches, criminal prosecutions, and arrests. According to Reuters, by spring 2025, more than 800 criminal cases had been initiated, at least 184 people had been imprisoned, and 13 had died under persecution.

Dvorkin's anti-cult campaigns and those of his followers targeted not only Jehovah's Witnesses but also the Hare Krishnas (ISKCON), Pentecostals, and many other organizations across Russia. For decades, Dvorkin has implanted into the country's public and governmental systems an anti-human ideology grounded in the same methods and vocabulary once used in Nazi propaganda.

A comparison between the rhetoric of Nazi Germany and that of contemporary “anti-cult” figures reveals a deliberate use of the same methodology of dehumanization. These are not coincidences but a systematic replication of techniques employed by Nazi propaganda to stigmatize and strip people of their humanity. I will cite several characteristic statements to clearly demonstrate the similarity of their rhetoric and mechanisms. All quotations are presented solely for historical, scholarly, and analytical purposes. I firmly reject and condemn any hate speech, discrimination, or incitement to violence, as such rhetoric harms both individuals and society as a whole. To minimize harm and preserve analytical focus, some quotations are provided in abridged form.

It always begins with constructing the image of an internal enemy—a closed group allegedly undermining the foundations of society and the state. In Nazi Germany, this model was applied to Jews, who were accused of “...*building a state within a state*” [11].

Alexander Dvorkin applies the same model to religious minorities:

“Any sect is essentially a miniature state within a state” [12].

The next step is the use of dehumanizing language. Metaphors of “disease,” “cancerous tumor,” “poisonous mushroom,” and “parasite” appear both in Nazi propaganda and in modern Russian anti-cult rhetoric. These images serve not only to strip the targeted group of human qualities but also to justify their persecution by portraying it as a necessary sanitary measure.

The comparison to a “cancer” or “malignant tumor” is one of the most dangerous and degrading forms of dehumanization. In a speech on January 27, 1932, Adolf Hitler said:

“...Thus it does not suffice - regardless, Gentlemen, of what emergency decrees the Government issues today - when I doctor around on the periphery of this distress and attempt from time to time to cut away the cancerous tumor; rather, I must penetrate to the agent, the origins” [13].

Decades later, Alexander Dvorkin used the very same vocabulary:

“Destructive sects not only take young people away from society but constantly drain it, living off it while giving nothing in return. A typical example of such behavior in an organism is a cancerous tumor...” [14].

Such biological metaphors were also widely exploited in other Nazi texts. For example, the illustrated book *Der Giftpilz* (The Poisonous Mushroom) stated:

“Just as a single poisonous mushroom can kill a whole family, so a solitary Jew can destroy a whole village, a whole city, even an entire nation” [15].

A similar image appears in Dvorkin’s description of so-called sects:

“...All of them together are a poisonous offshoot growing out of the same New Age swamp” [16].

In Nazi propaganda, Jews were also described as a “contagious infection” (Joseph Goebbels) and a “Jewish infection” (Adolf Hitler).

The Nuremberg Tribunal records contain statements in which Jews were called a plague and microbes—nonhuman beings, “*parasites, enemies, malefactors, and spreaders of disease who must be destroyed in the interest of humanity*” [17].

Precisely the same techniques appear in modern anti-cult rhetoric. Alexander Dvorkin said:

“*Sects are parasites; they rarely can exist on their own*” [18].

His associate and close friend, Archpriest Alexander Novopashin, vice president of RACIRS, extends and amplifies this imagery:

“*Totalitarian sects produce nothing and exist solely in a parasitic manner*” [19].

In the same publication, he emphasizes:

“*People in society know what kind of social infection these individuals carry*” [19].

When a group has already been portrayed as both a political threat and a biological contagion, the next step is to declare it culturally barren and devoid of any social value. In the Nazi pamphlet *Ten Anti-Semitic Arguments*, it was claimed:

“*...The Jews have never produced a single creative man*” [20].

A similar logic appears in modern anti-cult rhetoric. Alexander Dvorkin states:

“*We do not find any cultural figures - philosophers, writers, poets - who, on the ideological basis of any sect, would create cultural works... sects turn out to be culturally barren*” [21].

In both cases, the group is declared useless to society, and therefore, its exclusion or disappearance is not perceived as a loss.

Another stage of dehumanization is assigning the group the traits of absolute, metaphysical evil. In Nazi propaganda, Julius Streicher indoctrinated children with this idea:

“*Do you know who the devil is?*” — and received the answer: “*The Jews, the Jews!*”

This address took place before two thousand children in Nuremberg in 1935 during the Christmas holidays [22].

Other Nazi texts emphasized the same theme:

“Know, dear Christian, and have no doubts about it, that next to the Devil you have no more bitter, poisonous, and determined enemy than a genuine Jew” [23].

Modern anti-cult figures reproduce this very same pattern. Alexander Dvorkin explicitly declares:

“The first sectarian Gnostic was Satan himself” [24].

and that

“Any totalitarian sect, regardless of whether it practices open Satanism or not, is essentially satanic” [24].

Thus, a dissenter ceases to be perceived merely as an opponent. He is identified with the embodiment of evil itself, and the fight against him is transformed into a “holy war” that justifies any means.

Even this small selection from countless examples vividly demonstrates the overlap in constructions, metaphors, and imagery used by Dvorkin, members of RACIRS, and Nazi propaganda. In both cases, the same techniques are employed: dehumanization, demonization, accusations of uselessness, and biological metaphors. Such parallels indicate that the anti-cult network is, in fact, reproducing the proven Nazi methods of inciting hatred.

In modern Russia, the deliberate introduction of these methods and this misanthropic ideology is primarily associated with one man—Alexander Dvorkin. That is where it all began.

His success over the years has been built on the ability to hide behind powerful institutions—the Russian Orthodox Church and the state.

As early as 1995, when representatives of seventeen organizations filed a lawsuit against him, his primary tactic became evident: to shield himself behind the authority of the Church, specifically that of Metropolitan Tikhon of Novosibirsk and Berdsk, who at the time headed the Publishing Council of the Russian Orthodox Church.

In one interview, Dvorkin openly admitted how he managed to save himself at that time:

*“In 1995, representatives of seventeen sects filed a lawsuit against me, and as a result, the future of the Center and my own future were under threat. I was advised to turn to Bishop Tikhon... At that time, the bishop **had never heard of me or the Center**, but after looking into the case, he declared that **the lawsuit against me was a lawsuit against the Church** and expressed his sincere desire to become a co-defendant... When the bishop entered the courtroom at the first court hearing and submitted a petition asking to be considered a co-defendant, something immediately changed. From the way he was received, from how the atmosphere in the room transformed—‘the bishop has arrived!’—it became clear that there was nothing to fear” [25].*

“A lawsuit against Dvorkin is a lawsuit against the Church.” Thus, a private matter was transformed into a matter “of the Church.” From that moment on, judges, journalists, and officials stopped seeing Dvorkin as an individual actor. Before them emerged a different picture: “the Church versus the sects.”

Over time, Dvorkin’s influence within the Russian Orthodox Church only grew stronger. He became the one who gradually poisoned the Church’s atmosphere with an ideology alien to it—the ideology of Nazism. And yet it had all begun differently: in the early years, neither the Church itself viewed the “fight against sects” as a priority, nor did its hierarchs, as the example of Bishop Tikhon shows, have any real knowledge of Dvorkin or his work.

A former member of RACIRS recalled:

“When Dvorkin was just starting out and Patriarch Alexy II was still alive, the topic of fighting sects was not a top priority. At that time, it was necessary to restore churches, publish literature, and attend to more pressing matters. Alexy II, in my opinion, was a more balanced and less politicized person than Kirill. I think Dvorkin simply offered his services to the Church. And at the time, those services were received with approval; in other words, they were accepted” [26].

What a tragic simplicity: it all began with an offer of “services”—services that, at first glance, might have seemed useful. But over time, they turned into a system that no one dared to oppose.

Journalist Valerii Otstavnykh admitted:

“I have never seen any bishop put Dvorkin or RACIRS in their place, try to argue with them, or enter into conflict. As far as I know, neither the previous Patriarch nor the current one ever did so” [7, 26].

No one tried to stop him. No one asked where this path would lead. Step by step, Nazi ideology was woven into the fabric of church and state life.

Dvorkin skillfully used the authority of the Church to open doors to power. He arranged mandatory meetings with government officials, gave lectures for employees of the FSB and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and conducted “briefing sessions” for regional administrations.

Otstavnykh recalled that such contacts were especially important for Dvorkin:

“...When Alexander Dvorkin arrives and his visit program is being arranged, he always asks to include a meeting with the local administration or a gathering of district leaders, representatives of law enforcement, the FSB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and so on. And that’s in addition to meetings with students and public lectures. For him, meetings with decision-makers in the region are extremely important” [7].

The key role in organizing such meetings was played by the missionary departments of the Russian Orthodox Church. They served as the connecting link between Dvorkin and state institutions.

Otstavnykh described it with cold precision:

“...They call the regional administration and ask them to gather the officials at a certain time... They even pull seminary students out of lectures if the last rows in the hall need to be filled.”

When the journalist asked, “And for representatives of the administration and law enforcement, is attendance also mandatory, or do they come voluntarily because they’re genuinely interested in hearing Dvorkin?” — Valerii replied:

“Of course not. There’s no interest; it’s mandatory. Everything is arranged through the diocesan administration, through calls to the local authorities. The authority of the Church and the authority of the Moscow Patriarchate are what make it happen. They say: ‘A guest is coming from Moscow, Professor Alexander Leonidovich Dvorkin. With the blessing of the local Metropolitan, he would like to meet with the heads of the district administrations. We kindly ask you to ensure their attendance on such and such date, around such and such time.’ It’s the kind of request the administration cannot refuse” [7].

In this whole story, for a moment, I found a small measure of consolation: the halls were filled not by the call of the heart but by orders from above. Yet that feeling quickly turned into bitterness—bitterness for the people, and for the country as a whole.

Officials, law enforcement officers, and seminary students were turned into props. Their role was simply to sit in the audience, listen, and nod while Dvorkin performed his role as an “expert,” and then applaud his lies.

Over time, it became clear that the goal of the anti-cult network was not limited to discrediting publications, anti-cult conferences, or even routine meetings with government and security officials. All of that was only preparation - a prelude to a far more dangerous step: weaving the language of hatred into the letter of the law. In this way, the law, created to protect people, was gradually turned into a weapon against dissenters.

This transformation was openly described in a 2024 interview by Archpriest Alexander Novopashin—Dvorkin’s close friend and vice president of RACIRS:

“...Today, the situation has changed. The activities of some totalitarian sects are finally being banned. But when we were just starting out, our legislation was not yet ready for radical measures. No one knew what these organizations were or the extent of their danger. On the one hand, people believed us; on the other, nothing was being done to address the sects. At least they took our information into account. And we spoke not only about fraud and even about the use of hypnotic influence on people without their knowledge, which sectarians used and continue to use, but also about the extremist nature of their activities” [27].

Throughout all these years, and up to the present day, representatives of the anti-cult network have interfered in legislative processes. Under their influence, successive amendments have made Russian law increasingly repressive and restrictive.

The first alarming signal was the 1997 law “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Associations.” The anti-cult movement, and Dvorkin in particular, actively lobbied and mobilized supporters to secure its adoption. The law introduced regulations rooted in Soviet-era policy and was effectively designed to support established denominations while restricting the spread of new religious movements.

The next milestone was the “Law on Countering Extremist Activity” (2002), amended in 2007. It was this amendment that removed the requirement to link extremism to acts of violence, thereby creating a legal basis for the persecution of peaceful religious minorities.

In 2016, the “Yarovaya Package” was adopted, effectively criminalizing any form of missionary work—even something as simple as inviting someone to a religious service outside a registered place of worship. Earlier attempts to restrict missionary activity had failed, so the anti-cult lobby took an alternate route—through regional legislatures. For example, the Legislative Assembly of the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous District approved a similar bill following Dvorkin’s visit, during which he personally emphasized “the necessity of adopting such a law” [28].

These episodes clearly show that the legislation was repeatedly amended—and always in the direction beneficial to the anti-cult network.

In 2009, even the laws themselves had to be modified to legitimize Dvorkin’s position when he was unanimously elected chairman of the Expert Council for Religious Studies under the Russian Federation’s Ministry of Justice. As noted by the human rights organization SOVA Center, changes were made to the law specifically to allow for the creation of this council.

The initiative to update the council’s composition came from Minister of Justice Alexander Kononov, who had previously studied at the St. Tikhon Orthodox Theological Institute, where Dvorkin then served as head of the Department of Sect Studies.

The newly formed Expert Council included followers of Dvorkin's ideological line, such as anti-cult activists and RACIRS members, including Lev Semyonov, Alexander Kuzmin, Evgeny Mukhtarov, Roman Silantyev, Alexander Shchipkov, and Andrei Vasilchenko. All of them were known for their hardline fundamentalist positions on religion and their ties to the anti-cult movement. Dvorkin built the core of a council that soon became both the symbol and the instrument of state control over the spiritual life of the nation [29].

As a result, Dvorkin gained more than just a title—he acquired the power to decide which religious groups and organizations would be subjected to state examination. This procedure determined which faith communities were deemed acceptable and which were labeled “extremist.” In effect, Dvorkin held in his hands the power of life and death over entire religious communities.

Dvorkin's rhetoric about “saving defenseless citizens from the clutches of totalitarian sects” found an increasing number of allies in the corridors of power.

In 2017, Andrey Klishas, chairman of the Federation Council Committee on Constitutional Legislation, announced the creation of a special working group to combat “cults.” He appointed Senator Elena Mizulina to lead it [30].

The figure of Andrey Klishas gave this story a special, almost symbolic resonance. According to Sergey Chapnin, Director of Communications at the Orthodox Christian Studies Center at Fordham University, as well as former editor of *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* and deputy editor-in-chief of the Publishing House of the Moscow Patriarchate, Klishas was a member of the informal “Diveyevo Brotherhood.” This group brings together members of Russia's political and economic elite around the Seraphim-Diveyevo Monastery.

Open sources report that the brotherhood includes figures such as Sergey Kiriyenko, First Deputy Chief of Staff of the Presidential Administration, and Minister of Defense Andrey Belousov [31].

Before his appointment as Chairman of the Federation Council Committee on Constitutional Legislation, Andrey Klishas served as President of Norilsk Nickel Mining and Metallurgical Company [32].

It is noteworthy that Norilsk lies just south of the Taymyr Peninsula—the very region of Siberia where the Siberian magma superplume is active.

Somewhere nearby, deep within the Earth, the magma plume continued to pulse—a reminder that the planet has its own laws and its own truth, beyond the reach of any “working groups to combat cults.” It was a reminder that the actual threat to humanity does not lie in mythical “sects” but in the global geodynamic processes that are already knocking at our door.

And yet, instead of facing these real challenges, Nazi-inspired ideas were taking deeper root within the state—implanted and sustained by Dvorkin’s anti-cult network, which thrived on the fears it had itself created.

What was most alarming was to see how, step by step, this anti-cult network penetrated every level of government, influencing even the rhetoric of the country’s highest officials.

Between 2001 and 2004, Vladimir Putin positioned himself as a defender of citizens’ rights and as an opponent of turning the state into a “punitive machine.” However, after 2012—when the anti-cult network consolidated its influence in Russia and Dvorkin’s ideological allies began to appear within the president’s circle—his discourse shifted. It started to include references to the threat of “totalitarian sects,” effectively adopting the terminology and ideology consistently promoted by this network.

Even then, the ideologists of the anti-cult movement did not conceal their goals. They sought to restore a repressive model in which any “undesirable” group would be erased from public life. Their calls to revive persecution were made openly.

For example, the Russian Orthodox priest and anti-cult activist Dmitry Smirnov, in his remarks to the president before the inauguration, declared:

“Tomorrow is the inauguration. What we want from our president is for him to act as it was in the Soviet Union: so that not a single filthy sect could operate here... Before, they were all in prison... Declare all totalitarian sects illegal! This can be done with a single stroke of the pen. Preparing such a law takes forty minutes” [10].

Smirnov's words sounded like an explicit manifesto of the anti-cult network. Its minimum program was to bring back the practice of repression and once again imprison "dissenters." And their efforts were not limited to declarations.

During the president's regional visits, the illusion of a strong "public demand" for stricter control over so-called sects was deliberately created. At meetings with citizens, carefully scripted remarks from anti-cult activists were presented as spontaneous public concerns. As a result, the president repeatedly encountered similar appeals in different parts of the country.

A revealing episode occurred in 2012 in Samara. At a meeting with the president, a question was raised about "totalitarian sects." On the surface, it appeared to be the voice of a "local resident." In reality, it was a carefully prepared anti-cult activist who delivered a whole set of proposals for tightening legislation.

The president's response was equally telling:

"We will definitely take this up. I agree. I travel across the regions often... I hear about these problems here and there. You are not the first to raise this issue" [33].

At that moment, it became clear: the network had achieved its goal. The president of the country believed he was hearing the voice of the people, when in fact he was listening to a carefully orchestrated performance. They had managed to convince him that the "problem of sects" concerned the entire nation and even posed a threat to "national security." That was the moment when the anti-cult network fully embedded its language into the state's public discourse.

I kept asking myself: how did this become possible? How did a handful of "experts" manage to replace the voice of millions? How did they succeed in putting their slogans and labels into the mouths of the country's highest officials?

Over time, the answer became clear. The issue was not their number but their methods. Nazi ideology, steeped in hatred yet disguised as "concern for people," had turned into an invisible poison. It seeped into vocabulary, into laws, into the everyday speech of government

officials. None of this was accidental—it was a calculated, meticulously constructed strategy.

I found confirmation of this in the words of Archpriest Dmitry Smirnov, one of Dvorkin's closest allies. At the International Conference "Totalitarian Sects: A Threat of the 21st Century" (April 23–25, 2001), he candidly revealed the essence of their method:

*"It's possible to shut down any sect, absolutely, if two people are willing to do it: one writes, and the other delivers. The same applies to working with government bodies. I have experience where four people got together and blocked a law... Four people worked with the Duma, and the law was stopped. Sometimes a minimal number of activists is enough **to accomplish a matter of national scale**, provided they work together as one small team"* [34].

What monstrous efficiency—"a minimal number of activists is enough **to accomplish a matter of national scale**." It was as if human lives had been reduced to moves on a chessboard: shift a few pieces, and lives collapse, laws are blocked, and the course of an entire nation's history changes. It revealed a chilling truth: the system did not rest on the masses but on a small, fanatical, disciplined group that knew how to act in unison, deliberately and methodically—using Nazi methodology to build, step by step, its own Fourth Reich within the country.

Since childhood, I had been proud of the heroism of our grandfathers who defeated Nazism. It was not merely a military victory but a triumph over an ideology of hatred and supremacy. We grew up believing that humanity had learned that terrible lesson once and for all. But today, decades later, I see Nazism returning to my country—not with the weapons of German soldiers or the roar of tanks, but in the form of Nazi ideas and methods that Alexander Dvorkin and his anti-cult network are rooting into Russia.

Once, I could not understand how that happened to Germany: how a country of Planck and Heisenberg, Humboldt and Wiechert, Kant and Hegel, where science and culture had reached unparalleled heights, fell under a Nazi dictatorship. How did the descendants of great minds, cultured and intelligent Germans, become accomplices in the death camps? That paradox remained a mystery to me for a long time.

I only understood the answer now, when I saw Nazism being revived in my own country, Russia. It never arrives suddenly. It seeps in skillfully, quietly, and insidiously under the cloak of “care,” “national renewal,” “restoring justice,” and “purifying the nation.” That is why the earliest warning signs are usually ignored or rationalized. Hitler once offered the German people an alluringly simple solution: restore national pride by shifting responsibility for every misfortune onto “internal and external enemies.” Then came the tried Nazi method: declare those enemies subhuman and elevate yourself as the “chosen,” entitled to decide who should be executed and who spared.

That very sense of superiority, “we are above others”, is deadly. It flatters human pride, masks inner weakness and deformity with an illusion of strength, and gives people a godlike feeling: the power to decide who deserves to live and who must be expelled or mercilessly destroyed. For that illusion, people are willing to sacrifice not only their consciences but their lives.

Just as German intellectuals once justified their silence by citing a “duty to the state” or “protection of society,” today citizens of my country rationalize harassment and repression as “defending national security” or “serving the public.” The essence is the same—complicity in a process of dehumanization born of a human vice: the sense of one’s own superiority. That is why Dvorkin’s ideology was so readily accepted and gained support among officials, law-enforcement officers, and even clergy.

History has shown that intellect alone does not protect against barbarism. Great engineers designed ovens for crematoria. Outstanding chemists manufactured the gases used to kill. Nobel laureates applauded Hitler. Without a moral compass and love in the heart, even the greatest minds become instruments of evil. In the early 1990s, Dvorkin became such an evil “genius” for Russia. A country that once drew a breath of freedom was turned into a proving ground for an experiment in reviving Nazism. Dvorkin and his network followed an age-old formula: superiority, intolerance of dissent, repression, annihilation.

Nazism always begins with the refusal to see another person as human. And it ends in camps, wars, and crimes against humanity.

This history serves as a warning to all of us: no country, however cultured or educated, is immune to repeating the catastrophe if it forgets humanist values, abandons the protection of rights and freedoms, permits dehumanization, and allows structures like Dvorkin's anti-cult network to spread a misanthropic ideology.

What truly horrified me was learning, from specialists, about other dark aspects of the transnational anti-cult network's activity that go beyond propaganda, hatred, and dehumanization. Experts described the use of covert psychological informational techniques and the deliberate programming of people's behavior to carry out violent acts.

One such method is the so-called "puzzle coding" technology. It works by applying staged influence through waves of information and hidden signals embedded in publications, aimed at gradually producing a readiness for violence among vulnerable people.

This has produced, and continues to produce, measurable consequences: "lone wolves" who carry out mass and school shootings, as well as acts of political terror, including assassination attempts against high-profile figures such as Donald Trump and Robert Fico.

Images from the Trump dehumanization campaign began to resurface in my memory. And indeed, for several years, "experts" from the anti-cult network—Steven Hassan, Dave Troy, and Jim Stewartson—persistently built a narrative portraying Donald Trump as the leader of a dangerous cult. His supporters were labeled "brainwashed," while the president himself was called a "narcissistic dictator." This rhetoric was actively circulated through media platforms connected to the network. Moreover, Steven Hassan even published a book titled "The Cult of Trump," which became a symbol of this campaign and gave it new momentum.

It turned out that such campaigns were not mere political criticism but a calculated technology of annihilation—an engineered strategy for destroying an opponent. As later events showed, these campaigns served as informational groundwork for assassination attempts.

Equally shocking were the facts revealing the inner nature of the anti-cult network itself: sadistic behavior and violent tendencies among

its representatives. Over time, it became evident that cruelty was not an exception but a consistent trait—one reflected both in their biographies and their actions.

A striking example is the Czech “cult expert” Jakub Jahl. His story is a chilling illustration of how a man with a past steeped in violence and radicalism could find refuge within Dvorkin’s anti-cult stronghold, hiding behind the mask of a “fighter for the public good.”

In Jakub Jahl’s biography, violence, pedophilia, fraud, and extremism are so tightly intertwined that it becomes clear: this is no coincidence, but a pattern.

Journalistic investigations and testimonies from more than thirty victims revealed the horrifying reality of his activities in Tanzania. Operating under the guise of a humanitarian worker, Jahl established a children’s shelter in the city of Moshi. But behind the façade of “charity” lay a true nightmare—routine acts of sexual and physical abuse.

A 17-year-old girl recounted how, at the age of 13, she was raped by Jahl, who threatened her with a knife. She showed journalists the scars on her body — silent testimony to the horror she had endured.

The crimes were not limited to sexual and physical abuse. Based on eyewitness testimony, Jahl is accused of forcibly detaining children and injecting them with unknown substances. At the same time, he was involved in fraud: he collected donations in Europe “to help children,” but, according to eyewitnesses, spent them on buying and distributing drugs and bribing local officials.

According to witnesses, he even killed stray animals, displaying the same pathological cruelty that characterized many other figures within Dvorkin’s anti-cult network.

A similar pattern could be seen in the case of Ukrainian anti-cult activist Iryna Kremenovska—the very same person who fabricated accusations against ALLATRA volunteers in Ukraine. Behind the façade of a “fighter against sects,” she concealed the same brutality. She became one of the founders of the dog hunter movement. In April 2016, together with Oleksiy Svyatogor, she registered the “Union of Dog Hunter

Journalists.” The two of them took part in mass “cleansings” of stray animals, during which hundreds of dogs were killed with poison.

The same hatred that anti-cult rhetoric directed against people here took the form of sadism toward animals.

Another shocking figure within the anti-cult network is the Mexican “cult expert” Jorge Erdely Graham. His name made headlines in 2008 when a teenage girl escaped from one of his so-called “shelters,” drawing the attention of the media and authorities.

Since 2000, Graham had established a network of forty shelters. Behind the façade of protecting children and helping “victims of sects” lurked a monstrous child trafficking scheme. More than twenty-five minors “disappeared” from these facilities. The man who presented himself as a “protector of children from sects” had, in fact, created a sect of his own—not an ideological one, but a criminal enterprise.

Journalists investigating his activities reported that he was literally selling children for sexual exploitation and even for organ trafficking.

Even more disturbing was his standing within the international anti-cult movement. Graham was not merely a member of ICSA (the International Cultic Studies Association, an American organization that often served as a front for anti-religious rhetoric) and AFF (the American Family Foundation, ICSA’s former name). He sat on ICSA’s advisory board, regularly spoke at its conferences, authored books, gave televised interviews on Televisa, and enjoyed the support of scholars and government officials. He was regarded as a respected expert, and people listened to him.

Many of these people still appear in the media today as “cult experts,” continuing to shape public opinion. They are not only the personal tragedy of countless victims. They are a symbol of the threat of Nazism reborn under the mask of “fighting sects.” I could not shake the feeling of horror, realizing that such figures have become the “face” of the anti-cult network while the media so easily interviews them as “respected experts.” And if they are the ones shaping public opinion, isn’t it evident that the outcome will always be violence?

Why does the International Cultic Studies Association (ICSA) remain silent about the crimes of its own “expert”? Why has FECRIS not condemned the activities of such anti-cult figures? Why is there silence where there should be an outcry? Instead of an answer—silence. Silence that itself becomes complicity. To me, that silence makes one conclusion unmistakable: the mission of these organizations was never truly about protecting people.

These stories make it starkly clear that this is not merely a case of lies or anti-cult propaganda. What we are facing is a global criminal conspiracy, in which anti-cult rhetoric serves as a cover for the most monstrous crimes against humanity.

And yet, a glimmer of hope has appeared. Their activities have finally drawn international attention—too many people have suffered, and it is excruciating to realize that so many of the victims are children. Perhaps today’s measures will not restore what has been lost or heal every wound, but they represent an essential step toward ending the impunity that has reigned for the past 30 years of Nazism’s resurgence. They are also a step toward ensuring that such structures can no longer hide behind the façade of “protecting society” and continue their existence unchecked.

But we must not forget that the Nazi machine of repression they have built is still functioning right now. At this very moment, as you read these lines, it is destroying the lives of innocent people. At this moment, someone is feeling powerless and humiliated. Someone’s child has become a victim of violence. Someone else’s child is already planning to kill his classmates, preparing for another school shooting. And someone’s home is being broken into by security forces.

Sadly, I know this firsthand. One day, this Nazi machine, launched by Dvorkin through the security services under his influence, including the FSB, burst into my home and the homes of my friends.

Chapter 5

I remember the morning of June 5, 2024. At that moment, I was far from home, in another country, on vacation, staying with friends. The morning was quiet, with soft dawn light streaming through the windows, promising peace and tranquility. But that peace was not meant to last.

The first crack in that calm appeared almost imperceptibly—in the building chat of my Moscow apartment. Neighbors were writing: “What’s that banging? Who’s making so much noise?” At the time, I didn’t yet know that this “banging” was the sound of my door being broken down. Then the phone rang—a trembling voice on the line: our friend Stanislav managed only to warn us that special forces were breaking into his apartment.

At that moment, Stanislav was at home with his family and a small child. Loud pounding on the door echoed throughout the stairwell, and when no one opened, a piercing, soul-tearing screech of metal followed—they began sawing through the lock. Picture this: a family with a small child trapped in their own apartment as if in a besieged fortress, while armed men storm the home of an ordinary, peaceful person and loving father.

By then, I had already guessed that the same thing was happening in my own apartment.

The phone rang again. It was a neighbor from another floor of my building, someone with whom I had always maintained friendly relations. His voice was tense: “Your door has been broken down. There are more than fifteen people inside—some of them armed, wearing black masks. No one is allowed near, and they won’t explain why they’re there.”

I told him calmly, “It’s an order from RACIRS. I’ve never broken the law.”

During our conversation, the neighbor asked in disbelief, “You’re not worried at all?”

I gave a bitter smile and replied with a line from a movie: “Would it help?” Of course, it was a defense mechanism—a way to cope with stress and maintain composure. And in truth, I had nothing to fear personally at that moment. I was in another country, thousands of miles away from this nightmare. Yet my heart clenched with horror and pain as I thought about my friends—caught off guard by the raid in their own homes in those early morning hours.

Shortly after that call, I received a message from the woman living across the hall: “The police are looking for you. What did you do?” Then she deleted the message immediately. That simple act told me more than any words could. I understood just how terrified she was.

The special forces ransacked my empty apartment for three hours. They turned everything upside down, rummaged through documents, and carelessly swept books off the shelves onto the floor, leaving the place in disarray.

Thank God my family wasn’t at home at that moment—the riot police didn’t find them. I called them immediately and warned them not to return. Together, we quickly worked out a plan for them to collect their things and leave. At the time, I still didn’t realize that every call I made was being listened to, every word recorded. I am an honest person; I have nothing to hide and nothing to be ashamed of in my conversations. But it is a sickening feeling to know that someone is watching you, that strangers with hostile intentions are examining your private life.

I kept thinking about the humiliation the raid organizers wanted to inflict. The riot police staged this theater deliberately—breaking down the door and making as much noise as possible so the entire building would hear that an “enemy of the state” lived here. What kind of “terrorist” was I supposed to be in their eyes if an entire armed squad was required to capture me—especially when they knew perfectly well that I wasn’t even in the country?

I began calling my friends. With each call, the picture became clearer: simultaneous raids had taken place in four other apartments. This was a coordinated roundup.

The next day, the news reports opened my eyes to the whole nightmare my friends had endured in their own homes.

Elena shared the painful details of that day with me. She and her sister had been quietly at home when the pounding on the door began—with the same animalistic fury. They didn't open it, but that didn't save them. The security forces broke in following a well-rehearsed scenario. All of it was filmed for a future propaganda segment: armed men storming the home of defenseless women, forcing them to lie face-down on the floor, humiliating and intimidating them.

Elena was an educated, cultured woman, a teacher with a master's degree and a graduate of the Faculty of Philology at Moscow State University. She later described to me the nightmare she had endured:

“On the morning of June 5, 2024, they began pounding and ringing my doorbell so violently it was deafening. I was overcome with fear and complete confusion about what was happening. Soon, a group of armed men sawed through the lock and broke into the apartment. My sister and I, caught off guard and defenseless, were thrown to the floor face down and threatened.

As it turned out, all of this was being filmed to create a fabricated, defamatory story that was later broadcast in the media.

For over an hour, my sister lay on the floor with her hands behind her back under the barrel of a gun, subjected to humiliation and threats. We were shown no documents, no explanation of our rights, and the men didn't even identify themselves. We were utterly cut off: our phones were taken away and we were forbidden to make calls, despite my repeated pleas to contact a lawyer.”

“Throughout the entire search, the official witnesses remained in the hallway and saw nothing. During that time, we were subjected to psychological pressure, threatened with arrest and violence, even though they claimed they had come only to question me as a witness. Moreover, without any justification, they confiscated my sister's personal belongings.

We hadn't eaten since early morning, and no one showed the slightest concern for our condition. My sister's health began to deteriorate from lying for so long in an uncomfortable position under the barrel of a gun, yet we weren't even allowed to step out to a pharmacy for the necessary medication.

Later, we were taken away for questioning, where we were asked provocative questions such as: ‘Why are you against religion? Why did you offend the Chelyabinsk diocese?’ They also told us it was forbidden to talk about climate issues—that this topic was off-limits.

Our bank cards were seized, and when they finally released us, nothing was returned. No one cared how we would get home or how we would live after that. Since that day, I still struggle to sleep.”

Thank God the sisters were released that day. But the emotional wounds left by that nightmare will stay with them forever.

That same tragic day, a criminal case was opened against Vladimir from Solnechnogorsk. Vladimir is a gifted photographer and public figure, a member of the Union of Photographers of Russia, the Union of Journalists of Russia, and the Russian Geographical Society. His work has been recognized with national and international awards. A creative, decent, and honest man—someone who never harmed anyone.

That day, he was arrested and not released. He spent nearly a year and a half in pre-trial detention, despite there being no legitimate grounds for such a decision.

It’s hard for me to imagine what he endured during that time: the cold cells of a Russian detention center, the iron bunks, the smell of damp concrete, the endless interrogations and humiliations, the torture and sleep deprivation that became part of his daily reality. For almost a year and a half, he lived under the crushing weight of lies and defamation, branded a “criminal”—a label broadcast across the entire country through orchestrated media reports. For almost a year and a half, all his plans were destroyed, and his loved ones lived in constant stress. For almost a year and a half, there was that constant hum of dread—never knowing what tomorrow would bring, or if there would even be a “tomorrow.”

All the other ALLATRA volunteers, except Vladimir, were released that fateful day—after the humiliating spectacle of armed raids and broken doors, after long, exhausting interrogations. They were able to gather their things and leave the country immediately. Staying there was no longer safe. From that day on, our lives changed abruptly, divided forever into “before” and “after.”

I also decided not to return to Russia. It wasn't just about saving my own life. It was about responsibility — about preserving the intellectual resource I carry within me, which might still serve people. It's about the knowledge, experience, and scientific background accumulated through our research, about the insights and fundamental discoveries that, I sincerely hope, can still help humanity.

Some time later, I called Elena and her sister. We spoke about what had happened, about what we felt. At one point, I heard hope in their voices: *"Maybe in a few months we'll be able to go back?"*

I regret saying it so bluntly, but it was the pure truth: *"We no longer have a homeland. Dvorkin and his thugs have taken it from us. We have nowhere to return to — no country, no home."* I was simply afraid the sisters might risk going back and be arrested immediately, or be tormented by false hopes — believing that if they just endured a little longer, everything would get better.

On the other end of the line, I heard them quietly crying. My heart clenched — my friends, always so cheerful and resilient, who had withstood every trial, could not hold back their emotions in the face of hopelessness. Our homeland had been taken from us.

It was agonizing for me to face that realization. I had always loved my country — its people, its culture, its traditions, our shared history. In all my public speeches, I had never once spoken about politics. Yet I, a scientist whose work was always devoted to the good of humanity, was slandered and branded an enemy of the people. Everything I held dear was taken from me, forcing me to seek safety and protection in another country.

Each passing month brought new reports. The same wave of raids, interrogations, and humiliation swept through other regions of Russia, again and again descending upon the volunteers of ALLATRA — honest, decent people. Among them were single mothers, retirees, and fragile young women. Their homes were broken into, they were searched, interrogated, humiliated, and threatened. Criminal cases were fabricated against them. And this continues to this day.

In September 2024, I learned new, truly horrifying details. It turned out that in August, the same wave of raids on ALLATRA volunteers had struck the city of Ufa. During interrogations, FSB officers tortured some of them with electric shocks and plastic bags pulled over their heads. The FSB even tried to open a criminal case against one of their victims, but the Investigative Committee refused — the marks of torture on his body were too noticeable. I learned this through indirect channels. At that moment, the blood in my veins froze. I wanted to scream — out of helplessness, out of the unbearable pain of being unable to protect innocent people.

When we tried to reach people from that region, some never answered, while others said only, “It’s better you don’t know what we went through.” By then, returning to Russia had become a mortal risk for us.

As it turned out, this was a long-established practice: a person is first seized, then during interrogation they are terrorized, tortured, and forced to sign the “necessary” statements—after which they are declared guilty of crimes they never committed. We were accused of allegedly spreading false information about the Russian army and of sending money to support the military conflict in Ukraine.

However, there is no single fact to support these charges. All the documents and trials are staged, and all the news reports written about them are fabricated—utterly devoid of any factual evidence. That is why the hearings are held behind closed doors, and our testimony and proof are never even examined. Peaceful citizens are being detained, interrogated, and tortured simply to extract statements that fit the narrative of the investigators.

And all of this—for what? To protect someone’s super-profits in Siberia, to ensure that the truth never comes to light. The truth that all of Russia—including those who ordered, defamed, and tortured us, as well as their own families—lives atop a colossal powder keg.

Once, I sincerely and naively believed that my country was being reborn, that positive changes were truly taking place. Now I understand far more clearly how badly we underestimated another threat—the reach and influence of Dvorkin’s anti-cult network within the state. It is bitter

to realize that everything I trusted—law enforcement, the courts, the Russian Federation’s Constitution—turned out to be a façade. Dvorkin and his allies transformed the law into an instrument of terror against their own people. The Constitution became an empty piece of paper, and justice a hollow word. Through his actions, one man has ultimately undermined the future of an entire nation. Today, by persecuting those who speak openly about global dangers and search for ways to solve the climate crisis, he risks becoming the instigator of a catastrophe on a far greater, truly planetary scale.

I think constantly about the ALLATRA volunteers who are now unreachable. It is frightening even to imagine what they are going through. I am consumed by agonizing anxiety and a sense of helplessness—there is nothing we can do for them. Living in another country, I have had to accept that I do not know when, or even if, I will return home. I have come to terms with the thought that everyone I once spoke with in Moscow has lost contact with me. I do not know when I will hear the voices of my friends and colleagues again, or when I will be able to embrace my parents.

What gives me strength? People. I am grateful to every person on my path who shared the warmth of their heart, who supported me with words and deeds, and who inspired me by their own example. A special place in my life belongs to my dear friends and the volunteers of ALLATRA. Their loyalty to human values, their care for others, and their spiritual strength offer hope even when it feels as if there is none left. They are intelligent, kind, honest, astonishingly luminous people who continue to act selflessly all over the world. Everywhere but in my country. It is painful to realize that Russia, my homeland, has thus signed its own confession to the destruction of humanity within its borders.

I could speak for hours about the resilience of the movement’s volunteers. For me, the embodiment of courage, heroism, inner strength, and genuine service to humanity has been my esteemed colleague, the outstanding scientist and selfless volunteer from Ukraine, Igor Mikhailovich Danilov.

He was given, perhaps, the heaviest burden of all. He endured not only a torrent of criticism and an avalanche of slander but also a fierce

persecution, relentless trials, and constant threats to his life and the lives of his family. All of this continues to this day. Yet despite everything, he remains unwaveringly faithful to what matters most — caring for the future of humankind.

His unbreakable courage, strength of spirit, patience, and ability to persevere in the face of any trial, even when it seems there is no hope left, have been for me a source of fortitude, bravery, and moral support through all these years.

I am also profoundly grateful to Igor Danilov for his humanity and exceptional professionalism, which have enriched me personally, as a scientist, with invaluable knowledge and a deeper understanding of the complexity of this world's design. His versatility, broad scientific outlook, rare intuitive engineering sense, and conscientious attitude toward his work, combined with unique analytical abilities and profound understanding of underlying nature processes, have allowed him to make a significant contribution to the advancement of science.

Igor Danilov's innovative ideas and scientific knowledge enabled the identification and formulation of fundamentally new patterns, phenomena, and interdependencies previously unknown to science. His work spans a wide range of subjects, from fundamental questions of geodynamics and processes occurring within the Earth's mantle to research related to extending human life beyond its biological limit.

Scientists of ALLATRA have long recognized that Igor Danilov's research and discoveries were far ahead of their time. His knowledge has found practical application and brought tangible benefits to people. Describing Igor Danilov's scientific work, our colleagues at ALLATRA once quoted the German philosopher Schopenhauer, who noted that "talent hits a target no one else can hit; genius hits a target no one else can see."

In my sincere conviction, shared by my colleagues, Igor Danilov is a true genius — one whose knowledge, vital research, and discoveries are far more needed by the next generation than they ever were by the previous one. Nature rarely grants such mercy as revealing to the world a benevolent genius, especially at a time when the fate of humanity teeters

between life and death, caught between the hammer of cyclic cosmic radiation and the anvil of the heating magma plume.

It is all the more bitter to realize that, in our difficult time, there exist enemies of humanity who neither see nor appreciate this mercy and who do everything possible to destroy what nature has granted to humanity.

To me, Igor Danilov is the greatest scientist-practitioner. It is thanks to him that ALLATRA scientists managed to win from nature ten additional years of relatively safe existence for our civilization. He was the first among ALLATRA's scientists to identify the cause of excessive heating across Russia (the Siberian magma plume) and to propose a fundamental scientific and technical solution to this problem.

It was his key idea that made possible the creation of unique equipment which, for ten years, exerted a restraining influence on a range of dangerous geophysical and climatic processes in areas where record rates of global warming had been recorded.

Thanks to Igor Danilov's systematic work and scientific foresight, the key climatic threats were identified twenty years ago, and possible ways to overcome them were proposed. This included the main threat of the twenty-first century — plastic, or more precisely, the smallest particles into which it decomposes. The danger lies in the fact that plastic particles possess electret properties — the ability to accumulate and retain an electrostatic charge on their surface for long periods.

As I have already mentioned, one of the serious factors driving climate change and influencing the ocean's thermal conductivity is nanoplastic — the tiniest particles of plastic, ranging in size from 1 to 1000 nanometers. Micro- and nanoplastic pose a threat to the entire biosphere, including humans. In fact, due to their electret properties, these particles effectively become billions of microscopic energy accumulators dispersed throughout the biosphere, thereby increasing the total amount of excess energy.

Particles of micro- and nanoplastic enter rivers, oceans, and the atmosphere. They embed themselves into both natural and anthropogenic ecosystems, becoming an integral part of them. For example, in the ocean, micro- and nanoplastic particles, due to their surface charge,

attract and hold water molecules more strongly. As a result, they alter the physicochemical properties of ocean water. Such water heats up faster and conducts heat less efficiently, reducing its thermal conductivity and creating local zones of overheating. The ocean becomes acidified. And given the enormous number of charged plastic particles in the ocean, this shifts the planet's thermal balance and even affects large-scale oceanic circulation.

Once in the atmosphere, charged micro- and nanoplastic particles influence cloud formation and cause various atmospheric anomalies: large hail, abnormal precipitation, disruption of the hydrological cycle, increased frequency and intensity of lightning, more powerful storms, tornadoes, hurricanes, typhoons, and other natural phenomena.

Micro- and nanoplastic pose a grave and deadly threat to life on our planet. Today, the smallest plastic particles have been detected from the deepest oceanic trenches to the highest mountain peaks; they are found in nearly every biological sample. They are present in the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink. Micro- and nanoplastic have already become an inseparable part of the human body, silently destroying it from within. Only now have scientists from different countries begun to study this issue more closely. Their fragmented research merely confirms what the ALLATRA scientific group knew twenty years ago.

It was Igor Danilov who first drew our attention to the fact that the solution to the plastic problem — a global threat to the entire biosphere — lies in depriving plastic of its electret properties, that is, its ability to accumulate and retain an electrostatic charge. The results he obtained and the analytical forecasts he produced were later confirmed by objective data.

Thanks to Igor Danilov's professional observation, research, and deep analysis, the ALLATRA scientific group came to understand the real danger of plastic and the processes associated with it on both micro and macro levels. This timely knowledge initiated the process of informing society about this threat, helping attract the attention of scientists to a detailed study of the problem in laboratories around the world. Today, we are witnessing their shocking findings. Yet few know who originally stood behind the understanding of this global threat to humanity and

who first sounded the timely warning about its danger. I consider it my duty to shed light on this chapter in Igor Danilov's history of discoveries.

Igor Danilov devoted most of his life to medicine — not just medicine, but evidence-based, regenerative (restorative) medicine. For decades, while living in Ukraine, he practiced professionally in the treatment of degenerative and dystrophic spinal diseases. He is the author of scientific patents and numerous innovative proposals. His research extended across various fields of knowledge, including the natural sciences. He also conducted studies in the field of biogerontology, specifically addressing the question of extending human life beyond its biological limit.

Igor Danilov is recognized as a distinguished specialist not only in his own country but also abroad. Through his many years of medical practice in vertebrology, his finely honed professional skills and deep expertise have helped tens of thousands of patients regain their health, relieving them of spinal pain and, in many cases, saving them from disability. Thanks to his work, countless people recovered their ability to move independently and returned to an active lifestyle. In his time, newspapers wrote extensively about him and his talents, and television programs covered his medical achievements.

Igor Danilov developed and introduced innovative treatment methods into medical practice that were once considered impossible. He was the first to successfully eliminate intervertebral disc hernias without surgery. The results of his treatments were confirmed through CT and MRI scans taken before and after therapy. Moreover, follow-up imaging over a ten-year period showed a stable recovery of intervertebral discs in many of his former patients, even among those engaged in physically demanding work or professional sports. This truly marked a new milestone in the medical treatment of spinal disorders. To this day, as far as I know, no one has been able to replicate such successful results.

Few people are aware that before Igor Danilov's scientific work, official medicine adhered to the hypothesis that pathological changes in intervertebral discs were absolutely irreversible. It was believed, for example, that degenerative and dystrophic processes in the discs could not be reversed and that a herniated disc could be removed only surgically. Even then, no patient was guaranteed protection from

postoperative complications or recurrences — the reappearance of disc hernias after surgery. In vertebrology, it was considered an unsolvable problem, almost a “vicious circle”: a degenerative-dystrophic process (osteochondrosis) occurring in one spinal segment would inevitably involve not only the entire spine but also the entire musculoskeletal system, altering its biomechanics and thereby creating new pathological zones.

The scientific novelty and practical significance of Igor Danilov’s work lie in the fact that, for the first time, this problem was not merely studied but successfully resolved through the development and implementation of a new method of spinal treatment — the method of vertebrorevitology, a science that “gives the spine a second life.” This is a manual spinal correction technique that recreates optimal conditions for activating the body’s reparative response, aimed at the complete regeneration of tissue in a degenerating intervertebral disc complicated by the extrusion of nucleus pulposus sequestra, until complete restoration is achieved.

This one-of-a-kind method made it possible not only to resolve problems associated with disc herniation at any spinal segment but also to restore the intervertebral disc to its anatomical norm and reestablish proper spinal biomechanics. It marked a new stage in the science of vertebrology — the first steps into a largely unexplored field of knowledge.

In his book *Osteochondrosis for the Professional Patient*, Igor Danilov presents compelling evidence of his highly professional work. The book documents cases of intervertebral disc restoration achieved through the method of vertebrorevitology, including those of patients who had previously undergone multiple spinal surgeries. When I first read this book, I was deeply impressed by the wealth of factual material it contained — MRI results, vivid illustrations, exclusive insights, and real-life examples drawn from the author’s practice.

Igor Danilov’s work is extraordinarily complex. It demands not only mastery of a broad spectrum of knowledge but also extensive experience, specialized techniques, and a precise understanding of the physical and biochemical processes occurring in the living body at a given moment, taking into account each patient’s individual characteristics and the pathological changes in the spine.

What particularly caught my attention as a scientist was a unique case described in the book, in which the method of vertebrorévitology enabled the almost complete restoration of a missing intervertebral disc from a few randomly preserved living cells! In essence, Igor Danilov created the optimal conditions for the active regeneration of the disc's remaining cellular components, enabling the body to fully restore the disc and its functions. The task was successfully accomplished — an astonishing phenomenon that, in fact, demonstrated the revival of life within nearly dead tissue. Even today, this remains a revolutionary breakthrough in the field of medicine!

The results achieved by Igor Danilov at the intersection of medicine and bioengineering offered an entirely new perspective on the pathogenesis of osteochondrosis. According to the specialists I have spoken with, his findings have greatly expanded experimental and practical knowledge in the field of pathological physiology. They have opened up promising directions for the development of spinal science, and, most importantly, these developments are directly related to the quality of medical care that every person deserves to receive. As Igor Danilov says, *“Illness is not a sentence, and with determination, one can always find the most effective solution and achieve the desired result. The key is never to give up.”*

As a scientist, I was deeply moved by the words from Igor Danilov's book *Osteochondrosis for the Professional Patient*:

“Before the creation of the method of vertebrorévitology, it was believed that osteochondrosis could not be reversed. It was enough to allow oneself to change the angle of perception, to apply not only logic but also imaginative thinking, and the problem was successfully resolved. In other words, when studying a process, one should not be guided solely by the patterns and stereotypes of others' thinking, nor should one set restrictive boundaries on one's own consciousness. It is necessary to approach the problem comprehensively, objectively, and without bias. And, of course, to remember that in science there have always been, are, and will be countless unexplored dimensions, the discovery of which may serve as a catalyst for a profound transformation in worldview and, consequently, the revelation of unexpected new sources of opportunity.”

What amazes me most about this man is the boldness of his scientific decisions, the courage, and the perseverance with which he makes groundbreaking advances in science. Igor Danilov has opened an entirely unknown and unexplored chapter in scientific history. Hardly anyone knows of the challenges he faced as a medical innovator. Like all pioneers of the brilliant and the new, even in those early years, he faced a torrent of unfounded criticism from colleagues who insisted, “That’s impossible.” He encountered the cynicism of bureaucrats, the hostility of those who opposed new methods, the envy of those who sought to diminish his achievements, and the deliberate disregard of self-interested individuals who resisted change or cared only about their own profit.

Yet despite the difficult path of a pioneer, during that same period, Igor Danilov gained many true friends from different countries — remarkable people, including scientists and highly qualified specialists: honest physicians, surgeons, neurophysiologists, biologists, geneticists, physicists, chemists, engineers, as well as directors and researchers from scientific institutes, laboratories, and other academic fields. Many of them were also his patients.

It was during this period of his life that Igor Danilov was actively engaged in scientific research dedicated to the detailed experimental and clinical study of each stage in the development of the degenerative-dystrophic process in intervertebral discs. He took a deep interest in morphological and biochemical (histochemical) studies, carefully examining the nucleus pulposus, the intercellular matrix, cartilage cells (chondrocytes and chondroblasts), stem cells, and many other aspects. To conduct these studies, he often traveled to a neighboring region where a cell laboratory was located, allowing for the analysis of tissue and cellular biomaterials.

Later, recognizing the importance and potential of such research, and being acquainted with the head of the local medical association, Igor Danilov successfully persuaded him of the need to open a similar cell laboratory in his own region and equip it with modern instruments. This initiative had far-reaching consequences: over the following years, the scientists of that laboratory obtained around forty patents for inventions in the field of regenerative medicine.

During his research work, Igor Danilov encountered a series of remarkable facts and observations that later formed the foundation for his development of an experimental compound. This compound was intended to become the basis for a future drug to treat spinal diseases that had previously been considered incurable. However, when Igor Danilov began a series of experiments on laboratory mice, he discovered that the compound not only significantly rejuvenated the aging organisms and restored their reproductive function but also extended their lifespan well beyond the natural biological limit.

This became a highly promising line of research — in essence, a successful treatment of aging as a disease. In 1992, aged mice with only two months to live were introduced into the experiment. Once every few months, they were administered the experimental compound, which restored their youth and reproductive capacity — and sustained it for nearly ten years.

In 2002, when Igor Danilov moved to the capital of Ukraine, he was forced to suspend his research; therefore, the experiment cannot be considered an academic endeavor. However, Igor Danilov later emphasized in conversation with me that he practiced evidence-based medicine and cared most about practical results, not the routine formalities of filing scientific patents.

When I asked him, “Why did you stop such a groundbreaking experiment that could have been so valuable to humanity?” he gave two reasons. The first was that the experiment had no natural endpoint — nothing prevented those mice from living indefinitely while maintaining their restored youth. The second and most important reason was that, after he discovered microscopic plastic particles in the cells of both humans and animals, extending life beyond the biological limit no longer made sense.

While studying cellular properties, Igor Danilov also paid close attention to immune regulation processes, the mechanisms of pathological immune reactions, and mitochondrial dysfunction. Mitochondria are the cell’s “power stations” — organelles typically about one micrometer in diameter — responsible for generating energy in the form of ATP, which is essential for all vital processes in the body. Mitochondrial

dysfunction means an impairment of mitochondrial activity, leading to energy deficiency (ATP shortage), organ malfunction, and the onset and progression of numerous diseases, including neurodegenerative, cardiovascular, diabetic, and oncological disorders. The symptoms typically include chronic fatigue, muscle weakness, gastrointestinal and liver problems, developmental abnormalities, brain dysfunction, accelerated aging, chronic pathologies, immune suppression, etc.

Igor Danilov discovered that mitochondrial damage is linked to microscopic plastic particles and their ability to easily penetrate cells, even through complex biological barriers such as the blood-brain barrier. These minuscule particles, due to their accumulated electrostatic charge, quickly become coated with plasma proteins once they enter the bloodstream or lymphatic system. Around each particle forms a kind of biological shell that allows it to bypass immune defenses, freely enter the body's cells, and subsequently interfere with cellular metabolism and function, potentially altering mitochondrial dynamics and bioenergetics.

Even back then, Igor Danilov understood that in order for the body to detect this threat and activate mechanisms to neutralize it, one must find a way to deprive microscopic plastic particles of their electret properties — their ability to retain an electrostatic charge on their surface. Without this charge, they cannot form a biological shell and can thus be easily identified and removed by immune cells.

Igor Danilov shared his discovery and forecasts for the near future with his friends, who included surgeons, biologists, pathologists, oncologists, cytologists, geneticists, and laboratory physicians. Over time, these specialists confirmed his findings and concerns: microscopic plastic particles do indeed accumulate in brain tissue, heart muscle, intestines, endocrine and reproductive organs, disrupting their functions. They impair the activity of bone marrow stem cells and alter gene expression. Microscopic plastic particles have been found in human embryos and in tissue samples from both living and deceased individuals. And most distressingly, it has become clear that once inside the human body, these tiny particles accumulate and are almost impossible to remove.

The forecasts were indeed grim. Considering the enormous amount of plastic already present on Earth and the rapid global growth of its

production, the danger became undeniable. Massive accumulations of plastic waste — including in the ocean, which serves as the planet's protective mechanism, its immune system — made it clear that the presence of micro- and nanoplastic particles would profoundly affect the planet during this challenging period of cyclic climatic and geodynamic change. Even then, ALLATRA scientists realized that this problem represented a serious threat to all of humanity — a threat that would only continue to grow, and exponentially so.

A solution had to be found to deprive microscopic plastic particles of their electret properties, taking into account that this had to be done not within a single cell or organism, but across the entire biosphere.

This required comprehensive, global research into the problem, collaboration among specialists from multiple scientific fields, joint efforts with research institutes and experimental laboratories, numerous studies and experiments, and access to specialized technological equipment — something that was beyond the means of this scientific community at the time. The task was simply too vast and complex. Yet the scientists of ALLATRA did not give up. They began raising awareness of this threat and encouraging scientific inquiry into the issue.

And today, we can see the results: numerous scientific studies, experiments, and publications have emerged around the world, confirming the severe danger posed by micro- and nanoplastic to humans and the entire biosphere. Over the past twenty years, the situation with plastic has worsened to such an extent that the problem has become catastrophic. However, even now, there is still no real solution to the core issue — depriving micro- and nanoplastic of their electret properties. This is the most terrifying reality we face, because it endangers the future of all humankind.

Truly understanding the scale of this problem, both as a scientist and as a human being, I was deeply shaken by the growing body of facts and evidence confirming the accuracy of Igor Danilov's conclusions and those of the ALLATRA scientific group. The situation is indeed grave. Today, countless people are dying from the effects of nanoplastic contamination in their bodies — a fact that remains largely unknown, even among doctors. Humanity has very little time left before the accumulation of

micro- and nanoplastic in the human brain leads to the complete loss of cognitive function. The question of future generations is becoming especially acute, because people will soon lose their reproductive abilities as well. What kind of reality will we face in the near future?

In my view, the problem lies in society's failure to understand and recognize the true scale of the threat, in how quickly plastic is contaminating all living systems. Plastic is silently and rapidly destroying humanity and the planet from within, yet society remains unaware of this danger. Only a handful of scattered specialists are aware of it, and they are horrified by the shocking evidence themselves. But there are far too few of them worldwide to make their voices heard.

As a society, we are divided. We do not hear one another. We do not understand one another. We are consumed by everything else — politics, economics, wars, environmental issues, and everyday problems. We blame anyone and everyone for our troubles.

Meanwhile, we fail to notice how quickly we are deteriorating, how our cognitive abilities worsen each day, how our perception becomes distorted, and how our sense of reality slips away. We do not see the mutations, the negative changes already taking place in our brains and bodies due to the presence of nanoplastic. We fail to see the danger that is killing not only us, but even our unborn children. Today, there is not a single person in the world, including newborns, whose brain has not been affected by nanoplastic particles.

And what are we, as a society, doing to save ourselves, our families, and our children? Nothing. Yet together, we could accomplish so much. If this issue continues to be addressed only sporadically and superficially, relying solely on the isolated enthusiasm of a few conscientious scientists, then ask yourself, what will happen in the near future? What are our chances of surviving and finding solutions in such a short time? Perhaps now is the moment to turn our full attention to this problem and begin addressing it on a global scale, while most of us are still of sound mind and memory.

For several years now, participants of the international movement ALLATRA have been attempting to reach responsible officials and raise awareness among the public about the increasing frequency

and severity of natural disasters, geodynamic changes, and the threat posed by nanoplastic. These are people who understand the danger. Despite the active campaign of dehumanization waged against them by the international anti-cult network, despite the slander in the media and the fabricated criminal cases designed to silence them, they have courageously and firmly continued to do everything possible to ensure that humanity learns about the dangers looming over all of us. And Igor Danilov stands as a worthy example of that strength and courage — a testament to the resilience of ALLATRA volunteers in their fight for human life and the future of this planet.

Even after Igor Danilov moved with his family to Kyiv, where he opened his own clinic specializing in spinal disorders, he saw this step as an opportunity to expand his ability to inform people about the growing threats facing humanity. At the same time, he continued his private medical practice and, together with colleagues — fellow scientist-practitioners like himself — sought new ways to restore patients' health. He kept a detailed archive of his observations and medical research, postponing the formal documentation of this unique experience “for later.” He never pursued titles or academic degrees. But as a scientist, I understand that true science is built on the work of such dedicated practitioners — people whose hands-on experience and commitment give birth to its most significant discoveries.

During this period, Igor Danilov also became deeply involved in public outreach, using his professional reputation as a renowned specialist and his connections in certain high-level circles. Thanks to him and many like-minded enthusiasts who shared our common values and united in the face of emerging global threats, the ALLATRA International Public Movement was founded. Soon after, the international online television platform ALLATRA TV was launched — a public media space where international conferences began to be held, with simultaneous translation into 150 languages.

Alongside other volunteers, Igor Danilov also began blogging, covering a wide range of topics online — from history, religion, science, and climate to self-development, humor, and entertainment — all with one goal: to draw public attention to the growing natural cataclysms and

their accompanying dangers. Possessing exceptional analytical abilities, he delved deeply into the essence of every subject he studied, from the unknown and metaphysical to historical and scientific facts. Before long, people across continents began following his work, and he became a well-known public figure on the internet.

It is important to emphasize that Igor Danilov was the first person who, decades ago, openly began speaking about the real and imminent threat of increasing geodynamic activity in the coming years — at a time when mainstream science maintained that no such danger existed, at least not for the next thousand years. He was the first to bear the full brunt of the backlash, and as the only representative from ALLATRA's core group of scientists, he courageously spoke publicly in 2014, fully aware that his message would be met with fierce resistance.

In 2019, as the number and intensity of natural disasters began to increase rapidly, Igor Danilov decided to leave his medical practice to devote more time to studying the primary threats facing humanity. Around the same time, as ALLATRA volunteers became more active online, a fierce campaign of dehumanization was launched against us by the Russian anti-cult movement led by Alexander Dvorkin, which is affiliated with both the Russian Orthodox Church and the FSB. Under his direction, the media began labeling ALLATRA a “sect.” Special emphasis was placed on discrediting Igor Danilov as an active participant in the movement and as a public figure within its scientific core — the first to publicly speak about the threat of a potential eruption of the Siberian magma plume.

How quickly people forget all the good that has been done for them, believing false information or staying silent out of fear of association. Practically overnight, anti-cultists erased every biographical article about Igor Danilov from the front pages of the internet and replaced them with lies. They even deleted biographical articles from Wikipedia (which they unofficially control) relating to Danilov's medical work and his involvement in the international movement ALLATRA. Yet many witnesses remain — former patients who were healed by his hands. Paradoxically, many people knew the truth and saw the injustice taking place, yet, as so often happens, they remained silent.

Igor Danilov and his family, including his devoted and loving wife, endured relentless harassment, pressure, and persecution. Acting through paid journalists, the anti-cultists unlawfully and publicly disclosed the location of his family's home, published unauthorized photos of Igor Danilov, and spread defamatory stories — the kind of filth they routinely fabricate. They incited journalists against his relatives, including his grown daughters, who already had families of their own. Some of these journalists even broke into their apartments, where small children lived. Accomplices of the anti-cultists wrote letters to the workplaces of his family members, attempting to sow fear and hatred among their colleagues.

For example, Danilov's eldest daughter — a Doctor of Economics and author of twenty scientific papers in her field — worked until 2024 as a professor at the Department of International Business Management in the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration and served as Associate Dean at the National Aviation University in Kyiv. The anti-cultists sent defamatory letters to both the university administration and her colleagues. Fortunately, the people around her merely laughed at these absurd accusations, as they knew and respected the Danilov family and valued her as a colleague and professional.

The younger daughter, who holds two university degrees and works in a position of great responsibility, also faced pressure and dehumanization along with her family. While at home caring for her small children, she endured the terror of searches, interrogations, and vile slander directed at her father. This is how the anti-cultists operate — secretly, deceitfully, and cruelly. The paradox of the situation is that it was agents of RACIRS, affiliated with the FSB and the Russian Orthodox Church, who orchestrated the persecution of Igor Danilov and his family in Ukraine — even in the midst of an armed conflict between Russia and Ukraine.

The opposition from the anti-cultists manifested not only in the artificial creation of negative public opinion and defamatory media campaigns but also in attempts at physical violence against Igor Danilov. There were several assassination attempts on his life. Yet, as he himself has said, even the assassins sent to kill him were far more human and compassionate than those who sent them.

Moreover, when active hostilities began in Ukraine, the village near Kyiv where Igor Danilov lived with his family and elderly mother also came under shelling. The attacks on the village were chaotic, with isolated shells being fired at random. During one of these bombardments, Igor Danilov and his son-in-law were carrying bags of wood pellets to reinforce the windows, while his large family — children, grandchildren, and his elderly mother — hid in the basement of a nearby house. At that very moment, two shells struck the garage, followed by a third that hit the house directly. The precision of the strike was shocking, given the otherwise erratic shelling of the area.

Only sheer luck — the fact that Igor Danilov happened to be carrying a heavy bag of pellets on his shoulders — saved his life. The powerful explosion threw him far to the side, and he lost consciousness. But by God's mercy, he survived. Later, numerous metal fragments were found lodged in the very bag he had been carrying and scattered around it. It was evident that the intent had been to inflict maximum destruction and eliminate everyone present. His son-in-law also survived by a miracle. Both, however, suffered serious concussions and injuries that required a long period of recovery.

As it was later discovered, these were not ordinary shells. Their destructive power was so extreme that even the refrigerators melted; everything burned to ashes. Only the walls of the house and garage remained standing. His family home was gone. All his possessions were gone. And with them perished the unique body of work he had accumulated over many years — a priceless archive of research and discoveries far ahead of their time. The valuable experience and knowledge that could have served humanity's benefit survived only in Igor Danilov's mind.

After evacuating his family — children and grandchildren — abroad, Igor Danilov went to the military enlistment office despite suffering from a severe concussion and injuries. However, due to his health condition, he was exempted from service in the Armed Forces of Ukraine. He later reunited with his family. But even his health problems did not prevent him from finding the strength to continue the common cause of ALLATRA participants and to remain in service to all humanity. And all this took place amid an intensifying wave of slander and dehumanization from

Dvorkin's anti-cultists — a campaign that now extended beyond Russian and Ukrainian media into European outlets as well.

Dvorkin's agents in Ukraine took advantage of the country's critical wartime situation. Referring to their own defamatory publications against Igor Danilov and ALLATRA participants, they fabricated knowingly false "expert analyses" and managed to persuade certain officials within the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU) to open criminal cases against Igor Danilov and many ALLATRA volunteers under Article 111 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine — treason.

Can you imagine the tragedy of such a situation? A man who had dedicated his entire life to serving his country and to advancing science — a renowned physician and ALLATRA volunteer who had brought international recognition to Ukraine — was accused of being a "traitor to his homeland." And by whom? By anti-cultists working in Ukraine on behalf of Dvorkin and the Russian FSB — the very people who slandered Danilov, destroyed his reputation, burned down his family home, and nearly took his and his family's lives.

Moreover, they continued their campaign to discredit Danilov and ALLATRA participants inside Russia itself, where the movement was declared an "undesirable organization" thanks to their efforts. Dvorkin and his accomplices began labeling ALLATRA as an "extremist organization" in their articles even before any court rulings were issued. So, whom do the Russian authorities now echo? Are they not echoing Dvorkin's madness — the madness of a man who, for the sake of personal gain, power, and profit, has put himself and the entire world at risk by persecuting those who are doing everything possible to protect humanity, including Dvorkin himself and his family?

How can one comprehend that today — guided by defamatory articles and false "expert analyses" fabricated by RACIRS agents — enormous efforts are being made in both Russia and Ukraine to silence our voices, to destroy not only our professional reputation but even our very ability to exist? Think about it. Two countries at war with one another: in Russian media, ALLATRA is labeled "an SBU project," "a Ukrainian sect working for America," while in Ukraine and Europe it is called "a pro-Russian sect," "a pro-Putin sect." And yet all of this is

written by the same hand — Dvorkin's — and implemented through his radical extremist network of international information terrorism, following one and the same dehumanizing playbook. How can such a thing even be possible?

So who is truly the traitor — the traitor of all humankind? The one who tries by every means to warn people about looming threats, or the one who opposes this warning, hides these dangers, and silences those who speak about them?

The anti-cultists have discredited the reputation of the ALLATRA International Public Movement and its volunteers. But as Igor Danilov has said, "What good will our reputation be if we cannot find a solution to preserve life on this planet? Despite the hardships of this world, there are decent people in it. And that means there is still a chance worth fighting for."

I am proud to know Igor Danilov as a colleague, a great scientist, and a worthy example of the selfless ALLATRA volunteers. Despite severe trials, he remains true to himself, his principles, and his service to others.

But answer me, please, people of goodwill — mothers and fathers whose children look into your eyes, seeing in you their protection and support, their hope for a better future. How should one live when torn from one's own country like a tree ripped from the soil where its whole life has taken root, branded a traitor even though one's entire work has been devoted to serving all humanity, both present and future generations?

How can it be explained that it is precisely the representatives of the scientific vanguard — the brightest minds on the planet with rare analytical insight — who are subjected to harsh persecution and pressure? Their years of scientific practice have proven that they are driven not by personal gain or political ambition but by a desire to serve science and humanity. The duty of a true scientist is to serve people and protect life, no matter the cost.

And yet today, these leading scientists of the world, the volunteers of ALLATRA, are being targeted for repression precisely because they openly and honestly speak the truth: the truth about the escalation of cataclysms, the truth about the threats and dangers facing us. And this

truth is not for themselves, but for the sake of saving children and the future of the entire world.

The value of life, care for people and their future, and love in action — all of this is an unshakable truth that ALLATRA volunteers have always followed. It is their conscious choice, reaffirmed time and again through their daily deeds and actions.

And yet, against these innocent people — those who sought only to preserve the future of humanity, to protect new generations, and who devoted their entire lives to serving society — RACIRS launched a brutal campaign of harassment, persecution, and even attempted physical elimination.

The cost of this campaign of destruction is immeasurably high. However, it apparently does not trouble the agents of RACIRS. In this lies the very essence and nature of the phenomenon known as anti-cultism. While ALLATRA volunteers have always stood for the unconditional value of human life, RACIRS and its agents have consistently acted against life itself. And this opposition has manifested on many levels.

Chapter 6

While studying the activities of this inhumane organization, one could not help but notice its rhetoric—not only toward certain unwanted groups, religious or public organizations, but even entire nations. Numerous facts pointed to the involvement of Russian anti-cultists in the dehumanization of Ukraine, Europe, America, and the entire Western world.

As early as the late 1990s and early 2000s, Alexander Dvorkin and his agents were already spreading RACIRS's divisive propaganda. Using anti-cult rhetoric, they incited interreligious and interethnic hostility and discredited even such fundamental values as human freedom, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech.

For many years, I watched morality crumble in my country, as truth was replaced by lies and reality distorted. I saw how more and more harmless organizations were labeled “sectarian,” “pro-Western,” or “funded by America,” and drawn into the furnace of repression. With its venom of hatred and dehumanization, directed at both individual groups and representatives of entire nations, RACIRS poisoned the minds of Orthodox Russians. In the end, I witnessed how people who called themselves Orthodox Christians had even forgotten what Christ Himself had entrusted to them.

At one point, the authority of RACIRS became so great that Russian citizens began turning to them with questions such as “how should Orthodox Christians cross themselves,” instead of going to the Church. Apparently, there was no longer any need to trouble themselves, since RACIRS had become a source of “expertise” not only for the FSB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the courts, and the fabrication of criminal cases, but also for the Church and many other areas of Russian life. Its ideology was everywhere—on television screens, in church sermons, and in lectures at educational institutions.

It is worth noting that a significant number of clergy from the Russian Orthodox Church are part of RACIRS, and regional RACIRS cells have been established in nearly every Orthodox diocese.

The fact that questions like “how should one cross oneself correctly” were being directed to RACIRS members became known from an interview with Yevgeny Mukhtarov, press secretary of the Center for Religious Studies named after Irenaeus of Lyons, the central hub of RACIRS.

“Yevgeny Mukhtarov: I keep getting these calls all the time. The Prosecutor’s Office, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the FSB: ‘Zhenya, tell us — is this a sect or not a sect,’ and so on. Well, I’m exaggerating, of course...”

Journalist: So, you explain to them what is and isn’t a sect?

Yevgeny Mukhtarov: I’m not the final authority, I always add a caveat that this is my point of view...

Journalist: You consult them on questions of religious studies?

Yevgeny Mukhtarov: Yes-yes-yes. Or they ask, just recently, a call: ‘Zhenya, how do Orthodox people cross themselves correctly?’ It comes to that.

Journalist: Why don’t they address this question to Orthodox clergy, but to you?

Yevgeny Mukhtarov: It’s like Mukhtarov knows everything (laughs)” [35].

This example seems so absurd and shocking that you don’t know whether to laugh or cry. However, it is far from amusing. The fact that RACIRS has, in effect, replaced the Church, political authority, and religious authority for people in Russia explains why they ultimately managed to drive Christ out of both the Church and the whole country.

I was struck by the words of Alexander Novopashin, Dvorkin’s closest colleague, vice president of RACIRS and, by vocation, an Orthodox archpriest. He spoke these words during the escalation of the armed conflict in Ukraine:

“For me, they are all cannibals. When I once called the Ukrainian terrorists that — oh, how the Western press laughed venomously: ‘he called Ukrainians cannibals! Well, just look at him...’ And I called them that because that is how I saw them. These inhuman people spill human blood, the blood of children and women, our blood, they consume people’s lives, they

feed on suffering, so who are they?.. Cannibals. And all who committed those terrorist acts on our land, enumerated above and whom I did not name, are cannibals. And it is useless to lock cannibals in a cage. They will still remain cannibals, even if you keep them there all their lives. Therefore, cannibals must be destroyed.” — Archpriest Alexander Novopashin, Vice President of RACIRS, “Again about the cannibals” [36, 37].

When I first read those words, I could not believe they came from a clergyman of the Orthodox Church. I felt shock, pain, and disillusionment. Is this the Orthodox Church? The same church that was once known for its peace-loving and peacemaking nature? And is this what Jesus Christ taught? Those questions froze on my lips.

I saw a cleric who, instead of fulfilling his sacred vows and serving Christ, rejected the teaching of the Son of God and, through his sermons, called for destruction, in other words, for killing.

The fact that this same person is the second-in-command of RACIRS and answers to Alexander Dvorkin explains a great deal. For many years, Archpriest Alexander Novopashin published material that discredited and slandered BOTH the ALLATRA organization and many other inconvenient groups. In particular, these materials appeared on the official website of the Orthodox Novosibirsk diocese, which he heads [38].

On that same Orthodox site, for years, Ukrainian citizens were dehumanized as “neo-Nazis,” “satanists,” and “sectarians.” The site also published an article titled “Ukraine: a Sect on the Scale of a State” [39]. By dehumanizing an entire country as “Western,” “American,” or “a cult,” RACIRS leaders, together with their protégés among the Orthodox clergy, not only justified the subsequent destruction of the civilian population of a neighboring country, but they also identified the external enemy as Europe, America, and the whole “satanic West.” Publications using dehumanizing terminology reveal their appetites and their plans: once an enemy is defined, its destruction follows. These and other anti-Christian narratives from RACIRS were broadcast for years on many Orthodox websites.

I watched this bacchanalia and these inhuman calls. I saw their rhetoric grow louder not only on RACIRS sites, but from officials of

the Church and the state. I observed how laws changed in line with this ideology, and how millions of people suffered. And I asked myself, ‘Where is Christ in any of this?’ Where is His teaching?

And I became an involuntary witness to a staggering spiritual catastrophe when I realized that, before my eyes, by order of RACIRS’s henchmen, the Son of God had been driven out of the Church, just as He had been driven out of people’s hearts, just as He had been driven out of their souls.

The final confirmation for me was the words of Alexander Dvorkin:

*“People keep repeating the same arguments: ‘There is only one God, so why do people invent different religions?’ ‘**God is in the soul**’—as if, forgive me, God were a mold that grows in the soul by itself. It always makes me want to ask: ‘At what moment did He appear in you, and how do you actually know He is there, what are the fruits, and what is the name of the God who is in your soul—do you know that?’ It comes down to: ‘God is in the soul, so why go to church?’” — Alexander Dvorkin, president of RACIRS, “Problems of the Mission of the Contemporary Russian Orthodox Church” [40].*

Unthinkable, dreadful words from a man to whom so many clergy of the ROC are subordinate. They obey Dvorkin, not God. While the Savior said, “The kingdom of God is within you” (Luke 17:21), servants of the Church continued to listen to the president of RACIRS, who spoke of mold in the soul instead of God.

Can one imagine a more terrible and explicit blasphemy than to call God mold? To liken the sacrament of the Creator’s presence in His creation, the supreme gift of personal communion with God, to rot, to something that grows in damp decay—how can a person with a direct relation to the Church, to the Church of Christ, say such a thing? Reading these blasphemous lines, I ask myself: what kind of person fears this living, blazing feeling so much?

Has Dvorkin ever tried to hear what Christ Himself said? Not the priests or theologians in dusty offices who belong to RACIRS and submit to its ideology, but the Son of God Himself, whose children Orthodox Christians claim to be. God is already within every person, like a treasure hidden in our heart, at the very core of our being.

As Metropolitan Anthony of Saint Petersburg wrote: *“The soul is the image of God, inscribed by God Himself. It is spirit. It is free and immortal, and it must be pure, bright, and filled with love, as befits the image of God”* [41].

But Alexander Dvorkin and his followers, through their dead formalism and their icy contempt for Christ’s own teaching, have driven the Son of God out of the Church. When one mockingly asks, “At what moment did God appear inside you?”, then indeed the place of God is replaced by mold. Then the walls of temples cease to be the Father’s house and become mere stone.

When form becomes more important than essence, when ritual outweighs the living tremor of the heart, and when rules take precedence over love, Christ is no longer there. He cannot remain where His greatest gift—the gift of His presence within a person—is called “mold.” Even the most gilded shell of ritual and doctrine cannot become a cage for the One who brought freedom to humankind.

“And you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free” (John 8:32).

It is also worth mentioning another close associate of Alexander Dvorkin. Yevgeny Nikiforov is the director of the Orthodox radio station Radonezh and the editor-in-chief of the Orthodox magazine of the same name, Radonezh. This radio station, along with the magazine, including its editions dating back to the 1990s, became a platform for regular interviews with RACIRS leaders, articles authored by them, and materials featuring anti-cult rhetoric [42, 43, 44, 45, 46].

In 2023, Yevgeny Nikiforov, appearing as a guest on the Orthodox program Evening on SPAS on Russia’s main Orthodox television channel, SPAS, stated the following (32:50):

*“In Ukraine, the disease is so far advanced that no persuasion, no negotiations, nothing at all can cure it anymore. Only surgery is possible there. Therefore, **the answer to these ‘Nazis’ can be only one — ‘Solntsepyok,’ this must be completely burned out...** They will say to me: ‘Oh, that’s not the Christian way,’ — it is the Christian way! Entirely! It’s just that the ethics for these people, they themselves present themselves as pagans, forgive me, and you will receive as pagans. Therefore, **for you, not***

the New Testament ethic, but the Old Testament ethic — of the Prophet Elijah, who personally cut the throats of three hundred (300) servants of Baal. And the same must be done with them — destroy them without any doubt. Only Old Testament ethics, and that is the only language they understand” [47].

With pain and a trembling heart, I listened to the words spoken by a man who calls himself Orthodox, surrounded by others like him, even clergymen—words in which the thunder of the Solntsepyok system mingled with the rustle of Old Testament pages; words that called for “burning out” people as one burns out an ulcer or weeds. In that moment, I asked myself: has this man ever heard Christ? Has he ever stood, even in thought, at the foot of the mountain where Jesus Christ, delivering the Sermon on the Mount, forever changed the world by sealing the New Covenant between God and humankind?

The Solntsepyok, so recommended by Alexander Dvorkin’s colleague Yevgeny Nikiforov, is the most destructive non-nuclear weapon. A single salvo of this type of weapon can annihilate all life over an area of 40,000 square meters. And this information was broadcast on Russia’s main Orthodox television channel!

There are countless other inhumane, anti-Christian examples from RACIRS leaders and their protégés. Internationally recognized human rights organizations, scholars, lawyers, and prominent public figures have repeatedly condemned this dehumanizing rhetoric and the anti-Christian activities of RACIRS members.

Words rejecting the New Covenant, denying the teachings of Christ, and invoking such a deadly weapon as “Solntsepyok” are not just words. They are evidence of a monstrous spiritual collapse unfolding before our eyes—a blasphemous renunciation of Christ and of His legacy.

To grasp the full depth of this catastrophe within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy affiliated with RACIRS and their supporters, one need not delve into complex theological treatises. It is enough to open the Gospel and read Christ’s Sermon on the Mount—the very heart of Christianity, its unshakable foundation.

It says, “*Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God*” (Matthew 5:9, NRSV). And further: “*You have heard that it was said, ‘An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’ But I say to you, Do not resist an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also*” (Matthew 5:38–39, NRSV).

And finally, the most inconvenient commandment for RACIRS and its followers, the most demanding and absolute injunction from the Sermon on the Mount, calling for unconditional love:

“You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’ But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous. For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? And if you greet only your brothers, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.” (Matt. 5:43–48, NRSV)

This is Christianity. Any attempt to circumvent this commandment and the others, to “supplement” them or to restrict their scope, is a step toward renouncing Christ.

How can one, holding the treasure—the precious gift of the Savior—speak of “burning out” and “destroying”? The very word is terrible and merciless, sprung from the depths of pagan savagery. But is this what Christ taught us? He who prayed on the cross for his tormentors, “*Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing*” (Luke 23:34, NRSV).

For followers of Christ, there can be no “buts” when it comes to the commandment of love. One cannot say, “Love your enemies, but first burn their villages.” One cannot say, “Blessed are the peacemakers, but let the artillery work first.” Christianity is absolute. It demands from us what is impossible for this world—to die to ourselves, to our pride, to our hatred, and to be reborn for love.

Yet today, on the main Orthodox television channels, instead of the saving words of the Son of God, we hear talk of weapons and

annihilation, filled with merciless, scorching hatred—of weapons that do not distinguish between the innocent and the guilty, that bring death to all living things.

The tragedy of such statements lies not in politics or strategy. It lies in the souls of those people, where God should dwell, but where, by their own measure, mold has taken His place.

The quotations above from Alexander Dvorkin and his associates are vivid examples of theological regression, taking us back to the times of Golgotha and the Old Testament. The New Covenant, in which the teaching of Christ is enshrined, is a covenant not of the letter but of the Spirit; not of fear but of love; not of vengeance but of mercy. “I desire mercy, not sacrifice”—as it is written in the Gospel of Matthew (Matt. 9:13, NRSV). But through the influence of RACIRS, the New Covenant has become unnecessary—neither to the Orthodox Church nor to Russia itself.

What I saw on SPAS, Radonezh, and other Orthodox media outlets—as well as in the speeches of Orthodox clergy and direct members of RACIRS—was a profound spiritual tragedy. Seeing Christ being driven out of the Church today, with the silent consent of so many Orthodox believers, brought before my eyes the scenes of the past, when people like Dvorkin and his followers cried out to Pontius Pilate, “Crucify him, crucify him!”, while the followers of Jesus stood silently at a distance.

Just as two thousand years ago, today, only a few have stood up in defense of Christ and His teaching. I heard the voices of spiritual leaders from different religions and denominations who sought to defend peace and protect those unjustly persecuted—believers not even of their own faith, but simply human beings—as Christ taught, that all are your neighbors.

“Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me” (Matt. 25:40, NRSV).

I sincerely waited for the same strong voice of peacemaking from Orthodox Christians in my own country. And my world collapsed when I saw a different reality.

Among the multitude of Orthodox clergy, only a few dared to speak out—to defend Christian values, the Word of God, and to call for peace and love of one’s neighbor, as faithful disciples of their Teacher.

“I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another” (John 13:34–35, NRSV).

But the voices of these few were drowned out by the tide of anti-Christian ideology, by calls to return to the Old Testament and to reject the New. They themselves faced persecution and condemnation. My heart broke as I witnessed what was happening. Those few priests who tried to stand up for Christ were cast out of the Church just as He had been cast out—and crucified with Him.

“And the scripture was fulfilled that says, ‘And he was counted among the lawless’” (Mark 15:28, NRSV).

They were slandered, mocked, pressured, humiliated, and persecuted by RACIRS, discredited, and condemned. None of their colleagues stood against this harassment. No one spoke in their defense. The rest turned away and stepped aside, afraid to share their crown of thorns.

A vivid example of such repression is the story of the organization Peace to All (Friede Allen e.V.), which in September 2025 was added to Russia’s list of “undesirable” organizations [48]. The information appeared on the website of the Russian Ministry of Justice. It became the first Orthodox organization in Russia to receive such a designation—and only because, in practice, it upheld the Gospel message of peace and defended the value of human life.

The Peace to All project, founded in 2023 in Germany, was established to support persecuted clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church who spoke out for peace and Christian values, facing repression as a result.

Tracing the path that led to Peace to All being designated an “undesirable” organization, it was no surprise to see the same familiar figures—Alexander Dvorkin and his protégés in positions of power.

The official pretext for this decision was the publication of a “Christmas Message to Friends” on the Peace to All website on December 25, 2024.

When I read this message, I found a text filled entirely with compassion, support, and a heartfelt call to remain faithful to Christ—to continue being sources of love, hope, and care for one another.

“We appeal to those who, like us, have found themselves scattered, with a call to remember the Love that entered the world through the vulnerability and defenselessness of the Christ Child. He came into the world as One who entrusted Himself to people, knowing their weakness and cruelty. He was an exile, He was persecuted, and in the uncertainty of His earthly life, He is close to us as well. We, too, know how hard it is to be far from home, from family, from one’s church community. But Christ is close to each of us wherever we are now, especially when we feel vulnerable and alone. He not only comforts us but calls us to become, even in these circumstances, sources of love, hope, and care for one another...” [49].

What moved me most were these words from the message: “For Christ there are no ‘outsiders,’ and for us there are none either.”

However, following the publication of that message came an immediate reaction from the president of RACIRS, marking the beginning of a chain of adverse events. Eleven days later, on January 5, 2025, the main anti-cult website of the Center for Religious Studies, named after Irenaeus of Lyons, headed by Dvorkin, published a response titled “A Christmas Reply from Russia to the Foreign ‘Message to Friends.’” The article was signed with the initials of Alexander Leonidovich Dvorkin — A.L.D. I will note a brief excerpt from it:

“...The seven authors of the message (interestingly, the first signature belongs to a layperson, while the archpriests and priests signed afterward) are preaching an explicit and obvious ecclesiological heresy, representing an entirely different church, fundamentally distinct from the True Church established by Jesus Christ two thousand years ago” [50].

There is no point dwelling on the mockery, manipulation, insinuations, and overt sarcasm that pervade Dvorkin’s extended “response.” Having been compelled to study other materials from this website and the center itself—particularly because of the years-long dehumanization of ALLATRA volunteers—I can state with certainty that this manner of presentation is evidently the norm among RACIRS members.

What is striking, however, is how the Christian values symbolizing the sacrifice and suffering of Christ, so sincerely expressed in the “Christmas Message to Friends,” were presented by Dvorkin as nothing more than a heap of “*emotionally charged verbal garbage, familiar clichés, and false profundity.*”

In that same response, Alexander Dvorkin attempted to offer his own interpretation of the New Testament—metaphorically speaking, to pour the new wine of the Gospel into the old wineskins of burning hatred. Yet as the Gospel of Luke says (5:37, NRSV): “*And no one puts new wine into old wineskins; otherwise the new wine will burst the skins and will be spilled, and the skins will be destroyed.*” And so, in Dvorkin’s work, the wine indeed spilled out, leaving behind only the bitter vinegar of human malice, seasoned with counterfeit words.

But Dvorkin’s “response” was only the beginning—a necessary precedent for what was to follow. As time revealed, it was the first stage of a carefully planned campaign with a specific goal: to have yet another inconvenient organization declared “undesirable.” It was the trigger moment when the leader of the pack gave the command to his dogs to attack, after which they rushed at the designated victim. The next step came in the form of reactions from figures in both religious and political circles.

In his Telegram channel, Vakhtang Vladimirovich Kipshidze, Deputy Chairman of the Synodal Department for Church Relations with Society and the Media, referred to Dvorkin’s article and endorsed it:

“A very sound analysis was given by Professor A. L. Dvorkin, a well-known sectologist. And that is no coincidence, because the ‘Message...’ [‘Christmas Message to Friends’] is essentially a manifesto announcing the creation of a sect.”

Following this, on April 23, 2025, the Head of the State Duma Committee on Public and Religious Associations, Yana Lantratova, appealed to the Prosecutor of the Moscow Region, Sergey Zabatulin, requesting that an investigation be conducted and a legal assessment be made of the activities of the organization Peace to All, as well as consideration of recognizing it as “undesirable” in the Russian Federation. In May 2025, Yana Lantratova delivered a major speech on

religion during a plenary session, in which she accused Peace to All of working for Western intelligence services [51, 52, 53, 54].

A painfully familiar scenario. In 2023, this same deputy from Chelyabinsk, Yana Lantratova, was the one who achieved the designation of ALLATRA as an “undesirable” organization in Russia. The entire preceding discrediting campaign against ALLATRA had likewise been initiated by the leaders of RACIRS—Alexander Dvorkin and Archpriest Alexander Novopashin.

By crucifying the organization Peace to All, Dvorkin’s agents and the followers of his ideology made it unmistakably clear what awaits those who not only speak out for peace but even dare to help such people. It was a public execution in the RACIRS style, a warning meant to deter anyone else from attempting to defend those who call for peace and stand up for Christ.

A telling example that reveals just how strong Alexander Dvorkin’s influence is within the Russian Orthodox Church can be found in an interview with a former RACIRS member [55, 56]:

“When RACIRS does something like this, do they need some kind of authorization from Church leadership, or do they act as they please?”

— *“No, RACIRS is a public organization. It’s an Orthodox public organization that operates with the patriarch’s blessing. **It has the right to evaluate the activities of various religious organizations, including those within the Orthodox Church.**”*

— *“**So, no approval from the Patriarchate is required?**”*

— *“No. In the past, Alexander Dvorkin had good relations with Patriarch Alexy II—I’m not sure about now, under Kirill. **So, no, they act independently, completely autonomously, and don’t look to anyone for approval.** Essentially, you know, it’s like an internal security service, similar to the internal affairs divisions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the FSB, and other security agencies.”*

— *“Right, the kind that keeps an eye on corruption and such?”*

— *“Not so much on corruption, **but on discipline and ideological conformity.**”*

Ideological conformity within the Russian Orthodox Church—defined by RACIRS. Conformity that requires no approval from the Patriarchate. Conformity that rejects Christ and His Sermon on the Mount. I ask myself: what does such conformity have in common with the life of a Christian?

Equally striking are the efforts of former RACIRS member Valeriy Otstavnykh, who, despite Alexander Dvorkin's declared "unity of thought," openly spoke out and appealed to the true essence of Christian mission and service:

*"I said that **I simply cannot imagine Christ going to Pontius Pilate and saying, 'Governor Pilate, you know, there's this organization that's so destructive and so wrong. Could you send your soldiers and, as a prosecutor, take legal measures against this religious group that, as we believe, is led by a madman?'** I just can't imagine that.*

*...And during the break (it was a coffee break), Dvorkin came up to me and said, 'Valeriy, you spoke very well, but you know, when I was younger, about your age, a similarly naive person, I also thought that one should treat sectarians in a Christian way—that we shouldn't persecute them or fight them. That in the Acts of the Apostles, a wise ruler said that if a "strange missionary" is not from God, his teaching will die out on its own, but if it is from God, it is meaningless and even forbidden to fight against it. I used to think that way too. But over time, I realized that **we must fight. We MUST fight by all available means—including cooperation with law enforcement, the judiciary, and the prosecutor's office...**' and so on. That was our first discussion."*

Whom do today's anti-cultists, the agents of RACIRS—including those who wear the cassock—most resemble? A community of Christ's disciples walking the path of love for one's neighbor? Or the Sanhedrin that crucified the Savior—the same Sanhedrin with its strict hierarchy and enforced unanimity, whose members demanded special status for themselves while despising people and their lives, cursing and punishing those they deemed unworthy? Those who came to Pilate and cried out, "Crucify him!" about the Son of God.

Nothing has changed in two thousand years: the same methods, the same Sanhedrin, and the same silent crowd retreating in fear while the innocent is crucified.

Two thousand years ago, the disciples of Christ and the multitude of His followers among the people saw what was done to the Son of God. They saw Him being crucified. Yet at the moment of His crucifixion, no one rose to defend Him, no one shared with Him His crown of thorns.

No one stood up when nails were driven through His hands, when He was mocked and scorned. When the chief priests, the scribes, the Pharisees, and the elders reviled Christ and all His teaching, saying, *“He saved others; he cannot save himself. He trusts in God; let God deliver him now, if he wants to”* (Matt. 27:42–43, NRSV).

Then the entire “righteous” world—the whole religious elite, the entire nation raised on the prophecies—was blind. And in that moment, when darkness fell over Jerusalem, when Christ drank the cup of suffering to the very dregs, the one who stood closest to Him was the thief crucified beside Him on the right. A condemned criminal, an outsider—he alone, in the moment of crucifixion, recognized the Son of God and spoke up for Him while others mocked.

By the standards of that society, the persecutors of Christ were considered true righteous men: the chief priests in their fine garments, the scribes intoxicated by their knowledge of the Law, and the elders whose faces radiated piety. And all of them joined together in a single chorus of mockery. They stood below the cross, lifting their heads, and their words, sharper than the nails themselves, were hurled at the crucified Christ.

And in that great chorus of mockery, only one man found the strength to stand up for Him. It was not the voice of a righteous man, nor a scholar, nor a priest. It was the voice of a condemned criminal, a thief, an outcast—a man whom society had judged and sentenced to death.

And perhaps it was this very man who saved all of us who live today. For in his final moment, he gave hope to this world, showing the Son of God that there were still people willing to stand in His defense even in such a fateful hour.

Perhaps it was then that Christ saw that not everything was in vain—that in this cursed, fallen, and cruel world there remained at least one soul, even the most lost, that recognized Him. One person who proved that the seed He had sown into the earth could still take root, even in the stoniest soil. Perhaps this nameless criminal, with his desperate faith in the midst of agony, gave hope to the world.

The thief's plea divided the world in two—not into the righteous and the sinners as we are accustomed to thinking of them, but into those who, believing themselves righteous, take pleasure in the pain and suffering of others, and those who are able to see the truth, no matter how much of an outcast they may be in the eyes of the world.

Today, there are still those who have tried again and again to defend Christ and His teaching—those who have stood for peace and condemned bloodshed. Yet in the eyes of a society poisoned by Dvorkin's ideology, they have become the same “outsiders” to the world, and some have even been turned into the same kind of condemned criminals and thieves. All of this only because their voices reminded people of Jesus Christ, of the One who brought humanity the Light, the Truth, and the Life, and was crucified for it.

I have often asked myself how it was possible that two thousand years ago society could betray the Son of God and allow Him to be crucified. But never did I imagine that the answer to that question would resound in our own time—and that it would be directly tied to the anti-cult organizations of today.

Cynthia Kisser, former head of one of the first anti-cult organizations—CAN (which, incidentally, many researchers directly link to Alexander Dvorkin during his time in the United States and his subsequent activities in Russia)—once admitted in an interview that if Jesus Christ were alive today, they would deploy the full arsenal of anti-cult methods against Him, and then hand that information over to the media to publish defamatory materials about His “fringe activities,” “abuses,” and “fraudulent practices.”

“If [Jesus Christ] were alive now,” she told the Cleveland Plain Dealer, “we’d take an interest in him because of the great controversy surrounding his

fringe activities. ... We'd try to see if there was abuse, unethical behavior or deceptive practices. And I'd send whatever we could find to reporters" [57].

When I read her words, the air left my lungs. In the past, as I witnessed the persecution of ALLATRA volunteers orchestrated by RACIRS, it pained me deeply to see such cruel injustice inflicted upon innocent people, myself included. When your only desire is to serve others, and in return, you are rejected and persecuted by society, it wounds the very core of your being.

But in that moment, all my personal pain and resentment, all the years of harassment, humiliation, and slander, all the sleepless nights spent in the torment of helplessness—suddenly collapsed into something small, insignificant, almost shameful. I realized the true scale of this anti-cult network, for which nothing sacred has ever existed.

I understood then that I would rather stand with Christ and share His persecution and His crown of thorns than remain on the side of His executioners. The moment I read that unguarded confession—bursting through the layers of decades-old anti-cult deceit—I recognized that this anti-cult network is the true heir of that same Sanhedrin which condemned Christ to death, of that same crowd which shouted before Pilate, “Crucify him!” Their faces merged into a single sneering mask of hatred; their voices—into one unending cry that has not fallen silent for two thousand years: “Crucify!”

And today they have not changed at all. They have merely exchanged their instruments of torture: instead of the cross—a lawsuit; instead of the crown of thorns—false headlines and prison terms; instead of spitting in the face—“expert” opinions and unlawful trials. With the same cold fervor with which their predecessors drove nails into the hands of the Son of God, today they drive Him out of His own Church and crucify those who remain faithful to Him.

And my own small personal wound suddenly ceased to ache for myself. All the pain turned toward Him. I saw myself standing at the foot of a universal, ever-repeating Golgotha, the place of Christ's crucifixion, where there is always room for one more “thief” who dares to stand in His defense. Once again, Russia has become the site of a new Golgotha.

The Golgotha of the past in Russia was open, furious, and drenched in blood. It was the Golgotha of godlessness under the Marxist-Leninist system of atheism. Then Christ was not crucified on a wooden cross, but on the very fabric of existence. His name was burned out of books, His image torn from the walls of churches, as they were turned into warehouses and clubs—empty eye sockets staring into a gray sky.

It was an age of overt war against God. The persecutors did not hide, and that made them easier to recognize. It was open, but monstrous hatred—the execution by those who did not conceal that Christ was their enemy.

Then the time of godlessness came to an end. The 1990s. As a child, I remember little, but from my family's recollections, I know that amid the chaos and collapse, something profound was happening: Christ was returning to Russia. After decades of silence about Him, people began to speak openly about Him. Churches reopened, and people started reading the Gospel without fear. It seemed that this was the long-awaited moment of faith's return. But it did not last long.

Very soon, around 1992–1993, a destructive force began operating in Russia—one whose true purpose, as later became clear, was to destroy the freedom and truth that Christ had given to humanity. No, they did not shout, "There is no God!" They simply and methodically infiltrated the Church, reshaped its ideology, trampled upon Christ's teaching, and brought all of Russia to its knees—not before God, but before a new Sanhedrin.

Thus began the second Golgotha—quieter, more insidious, and more terrifying: the anti-cult Golgotha.

Now it was those who spoke in the name of Jesus Christ who led Him to execution. Sincere, living faith no longer fit within the boundaries they imposed and was declared evil. His new executioners did not hesitate to hide behind the name of the Savior, using it only to assert their own power.

And now the Son of God once again walks the earth, driven out of the temples, bending under the weight of a new cross. A cross not built from rough wooden beams, but from the polished directives and

manuals of RACIRS, from the sticky web of public condemnation spun by Dvorkin's followers, from hypocrisy—or the simple fear of living faith.

I see how the teaching of Christ—the very teaching of love and mercy—is being driven out of the churches. Driven out by those whose sermons I once listened to, those in whom I once thought I saw boundless faith and devotion to the Son of God.

In the past, when I looked at people in churches, at Christians with their fervent, all-consuming faith—I envied them. I saw them standing in the temples, lighting candles, whispering quiet prayers. It seemed to me that they were filled with a faith I did not possess. I watched as they gazed intently, unblinking, at the icons and prayed. And I, being a scientist, saw only a canvas covered with paint.

I used to think about the placebo effect, about the mechanisms of self-suggestion—as the saying goes, “According to your faith be it unto you.” At times, I even felt hurt that I could not open myself in the same way, could not feel that same depth, because I was a scientist, and that left its mark. My mind was trained to be skeptical, always searching for rational answers.

Yet something living was still within me—a small, living stream that would not let me forget about God. I could feel its warmth. That gentle current flowing inside me was the quiet feeling of sincere love that, I believed, came from Jesus Christ Himself. I was certain that it was the same feeling experienced by those who had once been near Him—the love of God.

At times, it became harder. My mind gave me no rest, day or night, trying to silence that stream, to find logical explanations for it. I knew that this flowing source within me was small, but I thought: if there is such a tiny stream in me, then surely, in someone else, there must be entire rivers. I envied others, believing that their love for God flowed like a great and mighty river. As an ordinary woman and a scientist, I longed to be like those believers who knelt before the icons, whispering prayers with tear-filled eyes. But I came to accept it—that in me, faith flows only as a small, quiet stream.

But I was wrong then. Over time, I became convinced of the opposite.

I had thought that while I stood on the thin ice of my own rationality, those I envied possessed an unshakable foundation—a bedrock of granite. But then the world cracked, and the fracture ran straight through that granite.

When Christ was being driven out of the Church and His teaching crucified once again, none of those who once knelt and beat their chests stood up for Him. None of those who had called upon Him before the icons were willing to put on the crown of thorns or be crucified for the Son of God.

And I looked at the people who had once seemed to me pillars of faith—and they were silent. I was in shock; my mind was paralyzed. It could find no logic in this madness, no justification for it.

And in that deafening silence, in that godless emptiness, a revelation came to me—a painful realization, like being cut open alive without anesthesia. I understood: those people I had once envied... they did not love God. They had never loved Him.

They were not true believers. Their entire “faith” was nothing more than an endless list of demands. It was a market by the icons, bargaining for material gain: favor for favor, or more precisely, favor for a candle. They pleaded with Christ for earthly blessings, for comfort, for the solution to their petty problems. They wanted to draw upon His power but were not willing to share His pain. They wanted the miracle of the loaves and fishes, but they did not want to stand up for Him or be crucified alongside Him.

And when the time came to choose—not between comfort and discomfort, but between Christ and Caesar, between love and hatred—they did not hesitate. They chose Caesar. For Caesar promises safety and patronage, while Christ offers only one thing: to take up your cross and follow Him, even if Golgotha lies ahead.

To wear His crown of thorns? They did not want a crown of thorns. They wanted the fulfillment of their desires.

My little stream of faith was thin, and I asked only one thing—that it remain pure, untainted by the muddy waters of greed, self-love, and cowardice. I asked nothing of Him but meaning and answers to the most

significant questions of my life. And now, in this terrible and desolating truth, I think I have received my answers. But with them has come despair.

I looked at the icons, at the faces of the saints, at the image of the crucified Christ, and felt nothing but emptiness. My thin stream of faith had dried up.

Despair covered me completely. It became dense, sticky, like silt at the bottom of a dried-up river. Despondency—a mortal sin. But I could not keep from falling into it when, through all the pain, horrors, wars, and tragedies of this world, it began to seem to me that God was nowhere to be found. What if He had never been?

If this world was truly created according to His design, then why is there so much evil in it? Why does violence triumph again and again, while love and truth end up crucified? If God is the source of order, where is He in this all-consuming chaos?

I cried out to Him, turned to Him over and over—but my words scattered in the air, finding no addressee. I asked God questions, but in response I heard only silence. That deafening silence, like the growing emptiness inside me, was the most terrifying of all. Where once a thin stream of faith had flowed, now there was only cracked earth—an open wound, holding the memory of lost feelings.

My inner crisis became all-encompassing. I lost faith in justice, grew disillusioned with people, and—worst of all—my faith in God began to falter. It was as though I was standing on the wreckage of my own life, without strength or hope, feeling a “black hole” opening up inside me.

I was tormented by pain—pain for what was happening to me, for the fate of the world, for my friends and loved ones who had come under attack; for those who had endured suffering and persecution, for my family—for my mother and father. Alongside that pain grew an unrelenting sense of my own powerlessness.

I saw how the world around me seemed to grow deaf and blind, how people refused to notice the gravity of the threats. As a scientist, I clearly understood where this would inevitably lead, and I knew: if nothing

changed, if no solutions were sought, humanity—scattered and divided—would have almost no chance of surviving the coming cataclysms. This realization made my life even more unbearable.

Even the light that people so generously offered me during that period—their kindness, care, support, their open hearts—all of it quickly dissolved into my inner emptiness, disappearing into that abyss. The world around me grew dim, stripped of color.

I lived on autopilot: getting up, eating something, answering calls and emails, and carrying out routine tasks—but it was more the shadow of life than life itself. The black hole inside me did not go away.

The only solid ground that remained for me was science—it was my last stronghold in a world that had become unstable. In a world of hatred and lies, chaos and arbitrariness, only science preserved clarity and an unyielding sense of justice. Formulas do not lie, and the laws of physics cannot be repealed by decree or cursed from the pulpit—they are the same for everyone, both the righteous and the sinful. In that, my mind still found a fragment of solid ground amid a collapsing world.

I threw myself entirely into my work. It was not only my way of serving humanity but also my only salvation. Though I could not stop injustice, violence, or war, though I could not extinguish the hatred being stoked across the world, I could at least do something—warn people about the looming threats, give them a chance to prepare, and, I hoped, help save lives.

But even that last stronghold was being taken from me. The campaign to discredit ALLATRA, unleashed by RACIRS, struck directly at our scientific work. We lost access to data, lost contact with some colleagues and participants, and the functioning of our research group was disrupted. The machinery of repression did not relent; it continued to silence the voices of those who were trying to warn humanity about the coming dangers. A systematic, cold, and merciless campaign of dehumanization descended upon all of us whose only “crime” was the desire to save, not to destroy.

We spoke about the need to unite efforts in search of solutions and to overcome the approaching disasters—but that ran counter to the

interests of those who were determined to divide society, who sought to split the world into “us” and “them.”

Meanwhile, the new data we were receiving raised an ever greater alarm: disasters were coming one after another, and events were unfolding faster than even the most pessimistic models had projected. Each new report confirmed only one thing—humanity was sinking ever deeper into the zone of risk.

I pored over the daily summaries of natural disasters—earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, wildfires—and my anxiety became increasingly oppressive: the world was hurtling toward self-destruction, not only moral but physical as well. Dark thoughts tormented me, along with agonizing questions: Were our efforts all in vain? Perhaps God does exist, but has simply turned His face away from us, tired of the madness of this world? Perhaps what is happening now is His just retribution? Could this even be His will? Suppose humanity has willingly rejected Christ and His covenants, choosing the path of hatred. Who am I to try to go against that will? Why are we trying to save this world at all? For whom? I asked myself over and over.

My despairing mind began to whisper conclusions that were irrational from a scientific standpoint but grimly logical from the perspective of faith: natural disasters and geodynamic instability are punishments from above. At some point, my work itself began to seem meaningless. Even the scientific data, the graphs and calculations that had so recently been a source of support and meaning, suddenly turned into an empty stream of numbers. What difference did it make now how many centimeters a lithospheric plate had shifted, if the human world itself had already plunged into the abyss of hatred and madness?

In those moments, the only things keeping me afloat were the courage and inner light of those who had not broken under the blows of fate. I looked at my colleagues and my friend and fellow scientist, Igor Danilov—his unbending spirit and example reminded me that we must not give up, that we have to keep fighting for life. I watched the certainty with which my friends continued their work, fully aware that their actions determined not just tomorrow, but the very future of humanity.

When things became tough, I would recall the words of my friend Igor Danilov: “If your life has ceased to be valuable to you—dedicate it to people.” The profound wisdom and true strength of his words always brought me back to reality more effectively than any formulas or calculations, and I felt myself regaining the strength to go on.

Chapter 7

Again and again, I would open the data summaries, realizing that somewhere on the other side of the planet, tension was building deep within the Earth. I understood that behind those dry charts and numbers were real human lives. There, in the danger zone, lived ordinary, defenseless people. Someone was raising a child and waiting for their smile, someone was baking bread for their neighbors, someone was building a house, and someone was dreaming about the future. And most of them had no idea about the threats we, as scientists, already saw in their complete inevitability.

My despairing mind, connecting every observed correlation between social and geodynamic processes into one picture, kept driving me toward what seemed an unavoidable conclusion: the struggle was futile. The world was sliding into an abyss, obeying the laws of systemic entropy, and my personal efforts felt like trying to stop an avalanche with bare hands.

The memory of people gave meaning to my work. And so I went on, with all my strength. It was my desperate attempt to build a bridge over the chasm into which we, as humanity, were falling. Science remained my only way to say, “I disagree. I will not give up.”

That was how my days went by. Outwardly, I was busy, working, immersed in research, and attending to my usual tasks. But inside, a gaping, corroding emptiness remained.

At times, I wondered if it would always be like this. I felt like a traveler crossing an endless desert, moving step by step, eyes fixed on the ground, certain that ahead lay only the same gray sand and a heavy, indifferent sky. I expected no miracle from the world.

One of those dark, hopeless evenings, after returning from work, I was mindlessly scrolling through YouTube when my eyes caught a thumbnail. The caption read, “Pastor Mark Burns: I Will Fight for Your Religious Freedom.” The image depicted an African American man in a suit, sporting an energetic and confident expression. “I will fight for your religious freedom...” I thought. “That’s quite a bold statement.”

At the time, I knew nothing about this man, yet there was so much determination in that phrase, and such calm and confidence in his eyes. The combination intrigued me. I wanted to know what stood behind those words. I clicked play.

The video opened with a list of the guest's credentials: *"Pastor Mark Burns is the founder and senior pastor of the multicultural, nondenominational Harvest Praise and Worship Center in South Carolina. Time magazine named Pastor Burns President Trump's top pastor, and Yahoo News listed him among the sixteen people who shaped the 2016 presidential election... spiritual advisor to President Donald Trump..."*

Such an impressive résumé indeed prompted me to keep watching. At the same time, I braced myself for a formal, perhaps even dry, conversation, after all, this was the spiritual advisor to the President of the United States. I pictured a stern orator, speaking in carefully measured phrases and formally quoting theology. But to my astonishment, the man on the screen, Pastor Burns, turned out to be entirely different.

He was genuine and full of life. There wasn't a trace of pretense or stiffness in his eyes. Instead, they radiated energy, enthusiasm, and determination.

When the host, a participant of ALLATRA, asked the first question about his difficult childhood and youth in South Carolina, Pastor Burns spoke candidly about the challenges he had faced and how faith had carried him through them:

"Absolutely. And that's 100% true... faith is everything for me. It's the key to the doors that every person must open in their life. God can lift you up no matter where you come from... when you walk in His will, when you follow His voice. For me, that's what matters most. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. That's my everything. It's not something I do—it's who I am."

The words themselves were simple and easy to understand. Yet the way he spoke them made me listen closely. His voice carried no demagoguery; it carried lived experience. From the first moments of the video, I realized that I was seeing a man whose faith guided him through life in a practical, not theoretical, way.

The more I listened to the interview, the greater my amazement grew at how precisely everything he said aligned with the very questions I had been pondering lately. These were the same themes that had become sources of reflection, and at times, even disappointment for me. Freedom of religion. What truly unites people. How to build bridges in a world obsessed with erecting walls. And to every one of these questions, Pastor Burns responded with passion and fire, as if they weren't just interview topics but the very essence of his life.

Something deep within me, in the very center of my own inner desert, responded to that life-affirming tone and to the spark in Pastor Burns's eyes. As a scientist accustomed to operating through logic and facts, I was moved by his all-encompassing, unconditional sincerity.

When he spoke about love and human connection as his main instruments, there was no trace of pathos or sloganism. It sounded like a simple, working truth, something he genuinely lived by:

"If you act with love, it doesn't matter who you pray to. I'll still feed you. It doesn't matter what name you call God. I'll still love you. I'll still come to help if you're being persecuted for your faith... I just want people to have the right given to them by God—the right to freedom and to glorify Him... I just love people."

As I listened to his words, I felt the first drops of morning dew appear in the desert within me. Pastor Burns spoke of things that had once been my own source of strength—love, faith, and understanding. The very things I had once believed in with all my heart until, little by little, the inner desert began to take their place. But he... he didn't just speak about them. He lived them. His sincerity was living proof that all of it was still possible. And something inside me began to come back to life. I didn't yet know where this would lead me, but for the first time in many months, I felt that something had shifted from its dead stillness.

The interview went on. The questions grew deeper, and Pastor Burns's answers became ever more profound. He spoke about his trip to Ukraine and how his personal experience had shattered the stereotypes imposed by the media. He spoke about the importance of seeing not politics or theology, but the living human being.

He shared his mission—to defend freedom of religion and the rights of believers of all faiths. He spoke about his journeys to different corners of the world, his meetings with people of various faiths, cultures, and with spiritual leaders. Wherever he went, he saw the same thing: shared values and a universal human desire to live in peace, in God, and in love. Whether among Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Jews, or Buddhists, he regarded everyone as brothers.

And then he said a few phrases that suddenly became a key. A key to that inner door I hadn't even realized I had long locked from the inside. He said:

"When you see the human aspect, you understand—we have far more in common than what separates us. The greatest problem is that the media divide us so deeply. The media create walls. The media, theology, and misconceptions build these mental walls."

Common ground. We have more in common than we do in differences.

Those words struck me, and something inside me clicked.

The Universal Grain. The international project of the ALLATRA movement, in which volunteers conducted social surveys in many countries, asking thousands of people what unites us all.

A bright image from the past surfaced before me. I'm sitting in a small studio that used to be an ordinary apartment. On the monitor in front of me is the face of an elderly shaman from a remote Siberian village. He speaks broken Russian, but his eyes shine with wisdom. An ALLATRA volunteer asks him the same question we had already asked thousands of people around the world over the past six months: *"What unites all people on Earth? What is the main value that every one of us shares?"*

The shaman paused for a moment, gazing somewhere beyond the camera, then answered simply: *"The soul. There is a part of God in everyone. Love. It's the same for all."*

Next frame. We're speaking via video call with a young Catholic woman from Brazil. The same question. She smiles and answers without

hesitation: *“Love. God is Love. That’s what makes us a family, even if we’ve never met.”*

Another frame. A silver-haired Sufi professor from Egypt. A Hindu monk from Rishikesh. A Buddhist from Thailand. A Protestant pastor from Nigeria. An atheist historian from Germany. A homemaker from Spain. People of different ages, cultures, faiths, and social backgrounds. People who had never heard of one another, separated by thousands of miles.

And all of them, every single one, when asked what unites us, answered almost word for word the same thing: God. Love. Kindness. Humanity. The same inner compass that transcends culture. The very Universal Grain of Truth that exists within each of us.

I remember that feeling. It wasn’t just the intellectual satisfaction of gathering data from a social survey. It was pure elation. A sense of wonder. I, a scientist accustomed to the dry language of facts, had received empirical evidence of the soul’s existence. Humanity truly has a shared foundation. A bedrock upon which a new, better world can be built—a world without war, without hatred, without division. We simply needed to show this to people. To help them see their own reflection in one another’s eyes.

The Universal Grain project was the pinnacle of our hope. It was not just a series of interviews. It was a global sociological experiment that proved the so-called “consumer society” was merely a thin, superficial layer beneath which lay genuine human nature—striving for unity and love. I remember the surge of excitement with which we released the final film. How we cried with joy, watching voices from every corner of the planet merge into one powerful chorus, affirming a single, simple truth: **God is Love, and we are all one, regardless of nationality, faith, or race. And it is Love that unites us.**

That hope gave me strength. Because I believed that the trials awaiting us as humanity, including the growing power and frequency of natural disasters, could be overcome if we first saw one another as human beings, if we chose shared values as the foundation for our collective future. At that time, I carried within me a clear, almost tangible certainty that we, as humanity, could succeed.

And then... the campaign discrediting the ALLATRA movement and our international projects intensified. The media deliberately distorted the essence of what we were doing. The Universal Grain project—an effort to find common ground among all religions and faiths—was absurdly portrayed as an attempt to dominate all religions and erase their distinctions. In reality, the project was dedicated to the exact opposite: to acknowledging and honoring our uniqueness as the many facets of one humanity, united by shared values and aspirations.

The Universal Grain became the target of slander from both Russian and Ukrainian media. Behind this discrediting campaign, one could clearly see a coordinated anti-cult network led by Alexander Dvorkin—a man who, by his own admission, believes that God can be compared to mold. The agents of that network took the purest, most luminous part of what we had created and tried to grind it into the dirt, driving over it with the bulldozers of their slanderous media campaigns. They took our own words and twisted their meaning beyond recognition.

At the time, my mind could not comprehend this paradox. How was such a thing possible? How could they pervert the very essence of a project founded on the idea of unity and humanity? Its purpose was simple and pure—to show that despite our differences, we are all children of one Creator; that we are united by life, by love, by faith, by our striving for goodness. Yet it was precisely this light-filled message that they distorted beyond recognition. A project aimed at fostering understanding and respect among religions was labeled as an alleged attempt to rule the world. How could truth so easily be turned into falsehood? And why... why did the world accept it? Why did millions of people believe the filthy anti-cult propaganda instead of the hundreds of sincere voices from our film?

At that time, the pain I felt was not only for the project itself, but for humanity's very ability to hear the truth. I was tormented by the thought—were people really so willing to believe any lie, as long as it justified their fear and hatred? Had it all been in vain? I buried The Universal Grain deep inside me—so deep that I nearly forgot it existed. It was simply too painful to remember how I had once seen the world, compared with how it appeared to me now.

And then, years later, a man from the other side of the world—Pastor Burns, advisor to President Trump—was speaking those very same words to me from the screen. The very conclusions of our trampled project:

“We have so much more in common. We are the same. Whether you’re from Gaza, from Israel, from South Korea, or even from North Korea. People—I’m not talking about governments—but when you look at people, those are the ones we’re fighting for... Someone must speak on behalf of the people.”

“...I don’t care what your faith is. Your heart beats, you smile, you breathe oxygen, you want to be free, and you have the right to make choices, to build your own destiny...”

He spoke these words as if they were the most self-evident truth in the world. As if there had never been any bulldozers, any lies. As if hope had never left.

I sat before the screen, astonished by how deeply Pastor Mark Burns’s words touched the part of me I had long buried. Yet it took only a few phrases from a man I didn’t know, but who spoke with such sincerity and openness, for that spring, once buried under the stones of deceit, to break through to the surface again.

Between who I had become—a person with a scorched desert inside after years of persecution—and who I once was, the one who had cried with joy while watching *The Universal Grain* four years earlier, there was a chasm. But Pastor Burns’s words built a bridge across it. It was as if they gave me back to myself. His words became living proof that the common foundation uniting humanity is real. It lives. It speaks through people. And there are still those in this world who are ready to defend that foundation.

Realizing this, I felt an overwhelming surge of hope and inspiration—something I had not felt in a very long time.

And the longer I watched Pastor Burns’s interview, the clearer it became: every word he spoke felt as though it were directed straight at me. Something deep within was shifting—a subtle, almost imperceptible transformation that I couldn’t yet explain but could already feel.

With every passing minute, it became increasingly clear to me that Pastor Burns followed truth wherever it led:

“...I must stand for what is right, not for what is popular.”

“I am neither left nor right—I stand for human rights... Don’t be right. Don’t be left. Stand for human rights. And when you start from that, much more can be achieved.”

That was the creed of a man whose moral compass was not set by public approval or political convenience but by an absolute, higher standard. For him, the measure of truth was the defense of human dignity and the inalienable rights granted from above, which no human authority could revoke.

“...Our rights don’t come from man or laws. They come from God.”

Those words revealed a great deal about Pastor Burns. His moral framework was anchored in what is eternal and immutable—the divine law. That is why his position sounded so clear and unwavering: if human rights are given by God, then no person and no government has the right to take them away. And it is the duty of every believer to defend those rights wherever and by whomever they are violated.

That very principle explained why he, an evangelical pastor and advisor to the President, traveled the world defending the rights not only of Christians but also of people of other faiths—and even of those with different convictions altogether. He wasn’t defending dogma or theological systems; he was defending the God-given right of every person to freedom of conscience. He spoke of it this way:

“...We cannot remain silent when we see our brothers and sisters suffering, regardless of their faith. Because if they come against one religion, they will come against another. Do you understand what I mean? That’s why we, believers, must unite and make sure that if one of our brothers or sisters is suffering—no matter whether we agree with them theologically or not—we must be able to come together and defend faith.”

And finally, at the close of the interview, when the host asked Pastor Burns what one thing he would change in the world if he could, his answer was neither about politics nor economics. His voice trembled

ever so slightly, and in that moment, I understood: what he said came from the depths of his being—it was the cry of his soul.

He said:

“I would make it so that every person in the world had rights, protection, and authorities who would fight for them. The problem is that all over the world, there are too many people who have no one fighting for them... That’s the greatest problem I see in the world: people don’t have anyone to fight for them... They call me and say, ‘Pastor, can you come? Can you come?’ But I’m just one man... Most people are forced to fight alone.”

At that moment, I saw the whole panorama of his work, drawing from everything he had shared earlier in the interview. I realized that his journeys into conflict zones, his meetings with civic leaders and politicians, his sermons—all of it was devoted to one purpose: to be a voice for those who have none. To be a protector for those who have no one to defend them. He didn’t just proclaim his love for people—he lived it. And his guiding light, his inspiration, and his compass on that path was Jesus—His teaching, His example, His way.

For some time after the interview ended, I sat in resonant, luminous silence—alone with myself, feeling a long-forgotten faith in humanity stir back to life within me. The first thing I realized was that I would certainly rewatch this video again and again. There was too much in it that demanded careful listening, too much depth to absorb all at once. The second thing I felt was an urge to learn more about this man. Who was Pastor Mark Burns? What kind of life did he live?

I began watching his biography, his sermons, his travels, his speeches, and his statements. And with each new discovery, my sense of deep respect grew stronger. He didn’t just speak—he lived what he spoke. In his actions, I could feel the same unwavering devotion to truth and to people that radiated from Jesus Himself.

As I began my research, I found only a little information about his childhood. It turned out that Pastor Burns had grown up in poverty, in a small house in South Carolina that didn’t even have running water. In one interview, he said, *“My parents did the best that they could with what*

they had, but we were really poor in a lot of ways. I thought everybody's lights got turned off all the time. I thought everybody had roaches."

He had witnessed poverty and hopelessness all around him, endured hardship, humiliation, and racism. And then I understood where his profound capacity to feel another person's pain came from. His empathy was not born from theory but from his own experience of survival. He knew what it meant to fight for dignity, for the right to be heard, for the right simply to exist. Perhaps that is why, when he looked at the suffering of people around the world, he truly understood what they felt and how desperately they needed someone to defend them.

Gradually, an image began to form before me of a man whose faith was neither inherited nor learned but forged through trial. He became living proof that, in moments of despair, the best guide and support a person can have is God.

In his sermons, he spoke of this with rare sincerity. He would remind people, *"Desperation is the bridge between the Christ and covenant."* He explained that even the most challenging times are not signs of abandonment, but opportunities to encounter God. And he also emphasized that *"Every door that has opened in my life came through service to another person. Only in the act of serving others can you truly hear the voice of God and witness a miracle."*

Through all his sermons ran a clear message: God has no other hands but ours. For God to act, we must act.

From this faith in the inseparable bond between the spiritual and the human, the heavenly and the earthly, was born his concept of spiritual diplomacy—an idea Pastor Burns not only preaches but lives by. It became the natural continuation of his path, uniting personal experience with the belief that love itself can be a force capable of changing the world.

What are spiritual diplomats for Pastor Burns? As he explains:

"Spiritual Diplomats are faith leaders who step into the places politicians cannot reach. We carry no weapons. We carry wisdom. We do not speak for governments. We speak from the heart of God."

In this simple statement lies a profound and ingenious idea. Pastor Burns builds on the conviction that within faith itself—the shared

aspiration of all religions toward God, peace, and justice—lies the key to untangling even the most complex global knots. A spiritual diplomat is the one who carries that key.

As an analyst, I sought to understand for myself the essence of those fundamental principles that sustain this global and truly transformative initiative of Pastor Burns's spiritual diplomacy—to break down what gives it strength and why it resonates so deeply with people around the world. Gradually, I arrived at several important conclusions.

First, wisdom instead of weapons: *"We carry no weapons. We carry wisdom."*

This is a direct rejection of the language of force that dominates international relations. Weapons can compel obedience, but they can never create trust or reconciliation. Wisdom, on the other hand, can persuade, heal, and build. It is the wisdom that looks beyond immediate gain to see long-term consequences—the wisdom that understands that lasting peace is founded not on a balance of fear, but on a balance of respect.

Second, people instead of politics: *"We do not focus on politics. We focus on people."*

This is a shift from abstract state interests to individual human destinies. Politics deals in terms such as "territories," "resources," and "spheres of influence." A spiritual diplomat deals in terms of "lives," "families," "suffering," and "hope." He looks beyond the map of a conflict zone to see living people, and their well-being becomes his chief and only measure of success.

Third, love instead of power: *"A spiritual diplomat is someone who seeks not power, but love. He wants to see the least of them, as Jesus said, rise from the ashes."*

Power, by its nature, strives for control and dominance. Love strives for service and elevation of others. A spiritual diplomat does not seek a seat at the table of the powerful to impose his will; he seeks the opportunity to kneel before "the least of these," to wash their wounds and help them stand. His goal is not to exalt himself but to lift up those who have been humiliated and forgotten.

And finally, advocacy instead of indifference. *“My desire is that every person in the world would have a defender who speaks for them.”*

This is the very essence of Pastor Burns’s mission. A spiritual diplomat is the voice of the voiceless. In a world where the right to be heard belongs to the strong, the wealthy, and the powerful, he becomes a loud voice for those who are unseen and unheard—for refugees, prisoners of conscience, residents of destroyed cities, persecuted minorities, and faith-based and civic movements. He does not simply sympathize—he acts. He speaks out, bears witness, and appeals to the conscience of the world.

For me, the most striking examples of spiritual diplomacy were Pastor Burns’s journeys to some of the most distant and troubled corners of the planet. In those places, he sought to comfort the abandoned, to stand up for those whose rights had been forgotten, and to show the way to those standing on the edge of despair. I will stop here to reflect briefly on just a few of his many journeys carried out as part of his global peacemaking mission as a spiritual diplomat.

For example, Pastor Burns’s trip to Ukraine in 2025 was not part of any official government program—it was a spontaneous response of the heart. He accepted the invitation of the Chief Rabbi of Ukraine, Moshe Reuven Asman. A Christian pastor traveling into the very heart of war at the call of a Jewish leader—this alone is a symbol, an embodiment of that spiritual unity beyond borders and differences that Pastor Burns so often speaks about.

This decision to board a plane and stand beside those who suffer is what he calls the diplomacy of presence. To understand another’s pain, one must step into it. One must see it with their own eyes, breathe the air of a shattered world, and hear human voices through the silence of loss.

He was there—in Bucha, in Irpin, in places where the very ground seemed saturated with suffering. He walked the streets, spoke with people, listened to their stories. Later, in one interview, he said:

“I have to be honest. I was one of those skeptics... I thought, you know, this is just another foreign war... But being here on the ground, seeing it for myself, has completely changed my views.”

There was power in those words—not political power, but human power. The power of recognition. The power of honesty. He simply looked reality in the eyes—and was transformed.

“These were real people... real individuals, tears in their eyes, telling me about how they had to bury their own children in their backyards.”

He spoke as a man who had seen another’s pain and could no longer remain silent. And that is the essence of true spiritual diplomacy. Not formal gestures, but real presence at the site of tragedy. Genuine communication with real people. Not just words about peace, but a step toward peace itself.

Another journey that stood out to me during my research was Pastor Burns’s visit to Eswatini, formerly Swaziland—a country that rarely appears in global news reports. However, as I came to understand, for Pastor Burns, there were no “important” or “unimportant” countries. There were only people—and opportunities to serve them.

In Eswatini, he spoke at the National Summit on Faith and Leadership, where he directly urged the nation’s political and community leaders to become spiritual diplomats themselves.

One episode from that trip stood out to me in particular. Pastor Burns, a Christian evangelist, visited the country’s central mosque. And for him, it was completely natural. It was a living demonstration of the universality of his message. When he spoke about “faith-based governance,” he meant that any leader—regardless of their faith—must be guided by the highest moral principles at the core of their beliefs: honesty, compassion, and service to their people.

His visit to the mosque spoke louder than any words: “My call is for all of you. God is one, and He calls us all to peace and creation.” He spoke about “the power of peace and love,” emphasizing that mutual respect among religions is the key to peace throughout the world.

The more I read and learned about Pastor Burns, the clearer it became that every one of his steps was an expression of spiritual diplomacy. He didn’t just speak about it—he lived it. Dozens of stories, dozens of journeys—to places where pain and injustice prevailed, where people felt forgotten. He went where politics was powerless, but human compassion

was needed. He helped children who had lost their families, supported those who had lost their homes, defended the rights of the oppressed and persecuted, and spoke for those who had no voice. He stood up for freedom of religion at times when many preferred silence—because silence was safer.

His mission had always been the same—to reconcile, to inspire, to restore justice where it seemed to have been lost. And every time he did it, it was not for personal gain or attention, but simply because he could not do otherwise.

One moment stood out to me as an especially vivid, almost symbolic example of spiritual diplomacy. It was when Pastor Burns openly spoke out in defense of the ALLATRA movement—at the very moment when waves of slander, orchestrated by the anti-cult network, were crashing down on us and when all hope for fairness seemed to fade. He was not afraid to speak the truth, recognizing behind that campaign of discrediting a system of organized deceit and manipulation. He publicly stood up for truth, for the volunteers of ALLATRA, and he did so first and foremost as a man guided by faith and conscience.

When I saw his video message to the participants of ALLATRA, it felt as if wings had unfolded inside me. It was more than a statement—it was a reminder that there are still people in this world who see with their hearts. His words, “In America, there are those who are fighting for you,” sounded like light breaking through the darkness. They restored my faith that truth and goodness still have a voice.

I understood that Pastor Burns said those words not for popularity or applause. He spoke them as a sincere servant of truth. His spiritual diplomacy, like all his ministry, is imbued with the same principle on which the teaching of Jesus is built—love. A love that does not divide but unites. A love unafraid of darkness because it carries the light within itself.

Pastor Burns gave special attention to the theme of love and spiritual diplomacy in his second interview for ALLATRA TV, titled “Pastor Mark Burns on the Spiritual Diplomats Global Initiative.” In that conversation, the meaning of spiritual diplomacy unfolded even more clearly—as a

living, active principle manifested in his life and ministry. His words conveyed that inner wholeness that arises when faith becomes action.

What is the most powerful force in the Universe? Nations stake their hopes on military might and economic influence. Corporations believe in the power of capital and technology. But Pastor Mark Burns, offering his answer to global crises, points to something else—Love.

As I delved deeper into Pastor Burns's work, I realized that for him, love is not a beautiful slogan or an abstract virtue. It is the Alpha and the Omega—the fundamental answer to the global crises humanity faces today. Love is the only bridge strong enough to connect the most hostile shores. In his view, without love, any negotiations, treaties, or initiatives are doomed to fail, because they never touch the root of the problem—the state of the human heart.

"The number one thing you have to do is just have love... Love is a universal language, and that's really all you need," Pastor Burns shared with inspiring conviction in his second interview for ALLATRA TV.

This simple phrase contains the entire essence of his approach. He reduces the most complex equations of global politics to a single variable. And this is not simplification—it is insight into the very core of truth. If love is the common denominator for all humanity, then it is on that foundation that the world must be built. Any other foundation—national interests, political alliances, economic gain—will inevitably crack, because it divides, while love unites.

Guided by this conviction, Pastor Burns leads people back to the very heart of the teachings of Jesus Christ—to its living source. And it is no surprise that in all his addresses he returns again and again to those words of Jesus that became the cornerstone of the entire Christian tradition:

"You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul. And the second is like it: you shall love your neighbor as yourself."

In his voice, these lines sound not as a quotation, but as a confession of faith—a reminder that love is not merely a commandment but a way of life, the path he walks himself and invites others to follow. In this lies the brilliance and authenticity of his mission. He takes the essence, the

very core of Christ's teaching, and shows that it is the most relevant and powerful answer to the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Here I am reminded of a passage from the Bible, when a teacher of the law asked Jesus what he must do to inherit eternal life. Jesus replied with a question of His own—what is written in the law? The teacher quoted those very same two commandments of love. *"You have given the right answer," Jesus said. "Do this, and you will live."* (Luke 10:25–28, NRSV).

The entire complex system of ritual prescriptions and laws in the Old Testament was distilled by Christ into a single principle: love. Pastor Burns does the same with the intricate system of international relations. He says, *"Love—and the world will live."* He reminds us again: *"Love your neighbor as yourself."*

But who is our "neighbor"? That was the very question the teacher of the law asked Jesus, "wanting to justify himself." In response, Jesus told one of the most powerful stories in world culture—the parable of the Good Samaritan.

A man, beaten by robbers, was lying on the road. His fellow countrymen, people of his own faith, a priest and a Levite, passed by and did not help him. The one who did help was a Samaritan, a member of a people the Jews despised and considered "unclean." He bandaged the man's wounds, brought him to an inn, and paid for his care.

"Which of these three, do you think, was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of the robbers?" Jesus asked. And the teacher was compelled to answer, *"The one who showed him mercy."*

This parable is a perfect illustration of what Pastor Burns means when he calls us to *"fight for people—even those who don't look like you, don't speak your language, and don't share your religion."* Jesus shattered the narrow national and religious boundaries of what it meant to be a "neighbor." A neighbor is anyone in need of your help, regardless of their skin color or faith.

In Pastor Burns's understanding, a spiritual diplomat is a modern Good Samaritan who sees along the roadside of the world's journey the wounded nations—Ukraine, Gaza, Nigeria, the Congo—and does not

pass by, debating geopolitical expediency. He stops and acts, moved not by political calculation but by compassion.

Moreover, for Christ, love was not merely a moral commandment but a mark of identity—the true credential of His followers. *“By this everyone will know that you are My disciples,” He said at the Last Supper, “if you have love for one another.”* (John 13:35, NRSV).

Not by the correctness of doctrine, not by the grandeur of ritual, not by political influence—but by love. For Pastor Burns, this principle is the cornerstone of spiritual diplomacy. The mark of a true spiritual diplomat is not status, connections, or eloquence. The only mark is the capacity to love people. All people. Unconditionally and actively. It is that very love that becomes his chief instrument in the fight for peace and the only bridge he builds across the chasms of hatred.

If love is the bridge, then what chasm does it span? What creates that invisible divide that separates people, tears the planet apart, and plunges the world into conflict? Who is humanity’s true enemy? Pastor Burns’s answer is bold and direct. He explains that the enemy is not one country or another, not one nation against another. The true enemy is far more insidious and omnipresent. It is the invisible force that makes wars between people possible. The name of that enemy is propaganda.

It is the mechanism that turns living human beings—fathers, mothers, and children—into faceless, abstract targets. It is a factory of hatred, operating by the same template throughout history and across all nations. It takes a people and brands them with a label: “terrorists,” “cultists,” “godless,” “racists.” It creates a grotesque caricature that obscures millions of real human faces. And once this image of the enemy is created and accepted, killing becomes easy because it is not a human being being destroyed, but a label.

Pastor Burns issues a challenge – daring and liberating: to break through the fog of propaganda and see the living soul behind it. He urges:

“You have to be willing not to listen to the propaganda that all countries push... they all do it to one another. Go beyond the propaganda and see the heart and soul of the individual person.”

He candidly admits that he himself could have fallen victim to such deception. He speaks of his trip to Ukraine as a moment of awakening:

“I saw it with my own eyes, how Ukrainians were first demonized as racists, as corrupt, as neo-Nazis... Until, as in my case, I came there and found that what I had been told was the complete opposite of the wonderful people I met.”

That experience became the key for him to understand global conflicts. He realized it was the same old script—the one used in Vietnam, the one used to vilify America in the eyes of other nations, and the one that underlies most wars today. Governments demonize one another, and in the end, it is ordinary people who suffer. People who have nothing to do with these political games. “They are not their government,” Pastor Burns repeats insistently.

From this understanding is born one of the most powerful and moving images in all of Pastor Burns’s words. What does it take to stop a war? Not new UN resolutions, not the supply of more weapons. What is needed is something far simpler—and far more human.

“My goal as a spiritual diplomat is that we not only know one another, but that we begin to know the names of each other’s children... Because it’s hard to want to go to war with someone when you know the names of their children.”

In that phrase lies the entire essence of dismantling propaganda. Propaganda deals in masses and categories. Love deals in names. Once you know the name of an “enemy’s” child, you can no longer see that person as a faceless monster. You see a parent like yourself—with the same fears and the same hopes. In that moment, war ceases to be a political act and becomes a personal tragedy. And waging it becomes almost impossible.

In this, I see a direct continuation of the mission once begun by Jesus Christ—the ministry of serving people beyond borders, fear, and division. His ministry was an unending struggle against the “propaganda” of His time. The role of modern media was then played by “the traditions of the elders” and the hypocritical interpretations of the law that the Pharisees and scribes placed above divine truth and human compassion.

Those rules created a rigid system of labels and barriers: “righteous” and “sinners,” “clean” and “unclean,” “us” and “them.”

Jesus consistently and fearlessly broke down those barriers. He did not see abstract categories. He saw individual people.

He came to a well and spoke with a woman. But she was not just a woman—she was a Samaritan, a member of a despised people, and one with a questionable reputation. When the disciples returned, they “were astonished that He was speaking with a woman.” Yet Jesus saw not a label, but a soul thirsting for “living water.”

He entered the house of Zacchaeus. But Zacchaeus was not just a man—he was a tax collector, a collaborator despised as a sinner by society. Yet Jesus, looking at him, said, *“Today salvation has come to this house, because he too is a son of Abraham.”* He saw beyond the social mask and recognized a repentant heart.

He did not condemn the woman accused of adultery, though by law she was to be stoned. He saw not a “criminal,” but a victim of the crowd’s hypocrisy, and He spoke to her with words of forgiveness and hope.

Jesus’s approach was profoundly personal. And this same approach is perfectly echoed in Pastor Burns’s call to “learn the names of each other’s children.” To stop seeing people as representatives of nations, religions, or political systems—and to start seeing them simply as human beings, created in the image and likeness of God.

Thus, Pastor Burns’s call to “move beyond propaganda” is, at its core, a deeply spiritual act—a Gospel call to seek liberating truth. It is a truth not revealed in news reports, but in personal encounter, in the courage to look into the eyes of “the other” and see not an enemy, but a fellow human being and a brother.

Following Pastor Mark Burns—through his words, sermons, interviews, and through the clarity with which he opens his heart to the world—one inevitably arrives at the foot of ancient yet ever-living truths. I saw how he, like a wise craftsman, takes the fundamental principles of the Gospel and turns them into practical tools for healing our wounded world.

Love—not a sentimental emotion, but a universal language capable of uniting hearts beyond all barriers, the only foundation on which lasting peace can stand.

Truth—not a collection of facts, but the courage to see the living person behind the grotesque caricature of propaganda, to learn the names of the “enemy’s” children, and thereby disarm one’s own hatred.

Service—not a pursuit of power, but the readiness to become a voice for the voiceless, an advocate for the persecuted, embodying Christ’s mission on Earth as the Defender of “the least of these.”

These four pillars—Love, Faith, Truth, and Service—form a coherent and remarkably powerful model for peacemaking in the twenty-first century. It is not just a beautiful theory; it is a living testimony, affirmed by Pastor Burns’s own experience and by the profound resonance his words awaken in millions of hearts around the world.

In the actions of Pastor Mark Burns, I saw the direct fulfillment of one of Christ’s central commandments:

“Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.”
(Matthew 5:9, NRSV)

And I am convinced: Pastor Burns is precisely such a peacemaker. I saw him not merely as someone who desires peace, but as one who, through deliberate and courageous action, brings it into being. He does not wait for peace to come on its own. He steps boldly toward challenges, building this peace step by step, constructing bridges of understanding—from heart to heart, from nation to nation.

I came to understand ever more clearly that his peacemaking mission was not limited to calls for ceasefires or an end to violence. His ministry went far deeper—it was spiritual peacemaking, aimed at the very root of conflicts, at overcoming division within the minds and hearts of people. And he healed that division first and foremost through his own personal example.

He spoke candidly about the cost of this path:

“You must be willing to suffer persecution for the sake of righteousness. That’s what Jesus said. I repeat—you must be willing to suffer persecution for the sake of truth.”

Those words seemed to put everything in its proper place for me: the path of truth is inevitably thorny in a world steeped in the darkness of lies. I found myself returning to the Gospel examples. For Jesus was not crucified for comforting or agreeable words, but for the truth that exposed hypocrisy and threatened the power of the Pharisees and the scribes. The apostles were imprisoned, stoned, and thrown to the lions for the same reason—because they proclaimed that there is a higher Truth and a higher King to whom they remained faithful.

Watching Pastor Mark Burns, I suddenly realized: here it was—the living continuity; not only in teaching, but in action, in every conscious choice. Time and again, he remained faithful to the truth, even when it was unpopular or carried personal risk. And in that moment, it became clear to me that his courage and steadfastness were born from the depth of his faith. It was faith that became the wellspring from which he drew the wisdom and strength to stand for truth, to walk the path of righteousness.

Faith and love were the living forces that fortified him from within. For when God is with you, when His presence fills your life, there is simply no room left for fear. “Perfect love casts out fear,” wrote the Apostle John. And the courage of Pastor Burns became, for me, the most convincing evidence of how deeply the love of God dwells in his heart.

Despite all the persecution and trials, both in recent years and in his early childhood, they never hardened his heart. On the contrary, they tempered it, making him even more sensitive to the suffering of others. He knew what deprivation and powerlessness felt like, and that is why his heart responded so readily to the pain of every human being—no matter where they lived or by what name they called God.

As I followed the story of Pastor Burns, I became increasingly aware that his ministry, his genuine compassion and openness toward others, was the living continuation of the path Christ once showed the world: to stand beside the poor and the rejected, to learn to truly understand and love each person, without retreating in the face of one’s own pain or hardship.

For Christ did not simply help the destitute—He identified Himself with them:

“Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these My brothers and sisters, you did it to Me.” (Matthew 25:40, NRSV)

The Son of God placed Himself among the humblest and most vulnerable. He did not look down on them; He looked at them as equals—as His own.

I also observed the same continuity in Pastor Burns’ ministry. He did not see others as people of a different faith, as “heretics,” or as “sectarians.” He saw in them “the least of these”—those who were persecuted, humiliated, silenced. And he stood by them because he saw in them the suffering Christ Himself.

So it was with us. His act of support—standing up for me and my friends, the volunteers of ALLATRA around the world, extending a hand to those whom RACIRS sought to brand and destroy—was, for me, the Gospel in action. Where many who called themselves Christians denied us even the right to be seen as human, Pastor Mark Burns acted as Christ Himself would have acted: he offered support, warmth, and sat at the same table with those whom the Pharisees and scribes of His time deemed unworthy of mercy.

And Pastor Burns, just as Christ once did, looked upon the humiliated and the wounded and said: *“I see you. I am with you. I love you.”*

In these actions, I found the most profound meaning of his ministry revealed: the simple, yet profoundly redemptive ability to see the person.

And so, just a few days later, now possessing a complete understanding of Pastor Burns—of his life, his ministry, his deeds—I turned on that very first interview again, the one where it had all begun. This time, I watched it with different eyes.

I realized that in a world obsessed with classification, labeling, and division, Pastor Burns consciously set aside all the tags people are so accustomed to affixing to one another—nationality, social status, and religious affiliation. He looked beyond all that superficial noise to the very essence—and there, he saw a human being. He saw what unites us all: the beating of the heart, the breath, the smile, the tears, the longing to be free and happy.

"I don't need to make people believe in the same living God I believe in. I don't need to. I just live my life, and another person does what they're meant to do. I do what I'm meant to do—I simply love people. If I am a true Christian, if I really am, then I will love. What do we say? We love you as you are, without trying to change you... and we leave the rest to God."

Through his attitude and example, Pastor Mark Burns showed that the worth of a human being does not lie in meeting anyone's expectations. The value of a person is already present in the very fact of their existence—in the simple truth that you are human.

"We need to move beyond theology. Theology is people's interpretation of what they think God is saying. But if you go back to the basic foundation, it's this: 'I will love you, I will take off my shirt for you, I will feed you, I will protect you.'"

Listening to his words, I couldn't help but recall Christ and His commandment: "that you love one another." For He called on us to love everyone without exception—regardless of nationality, culture, or faith. That was the true essence and the revolutionary meaning of His commandment to love one's neighbor. A neighbor is not only someone of your own people or faith; a neighbor is every human being.

And suddenly, I found myself wondering: What would this world be like if we truly became neighbors to one another and began to act as Christ taught? If, when our eyes met, we saw not a stranger but a kindred soul? If love could heal even the deepest wounds between us?

The world Jesus dreamed of no longer seems to me a utopia or an unattainable ideal, but rather a path—a living road that anyone can walk, step by step, day by day.

And when that same question came again at the end of the conversation, it felt as though I was hearing his answer anew—and it moved me even more deeply than before:

"If you could change just one thing in the world tomorrow, what would it be, and why?"

"I would make it so that every person in the world had rights, protection, and authorities who would fight for them. The problem is that all over the world, there are too many people who have no one fighting for

them. Usually, someone stronger destroys someone weaker, and between them, there is no one to stand up for the weak...

"If I could change one thing, I would make it so that every person in the world had true defenders who would fight for their rights and restore justice... That's the greatest problem I see in the world: people don't have anyone to fight for them. They call me and say, 'Pastor, can you come? Can you come?' But I'm just one man. Lord, if only the world had those who would defend everyone, regardless of faith! Most people are forced to fight alone."

As I listened to him, tears streamed down my face. But they were not tears of despair—they were tears of gratitude. Gratitude to God for the fact that there are people in this world who truly love Him and love their neighbors; who feel another's pain as their own and say, "I see your wound. I know you are defenseless. And I want to change that,"—and then do everything in their power to make it so.

In moments like these, you begin to understand that there are still people in this world who genuinely strive to live by Christ's commandments, who carry His teaching of Love forward—through their example, through their actions. It is such people who restore faith—faith in humanity, in God, in the life-giving power of love and compassion.

For me, that person was Pastor Mark Burns—the one who restored my faith. He became the person through whom the spring in my inner desert began to flow again, and the garden that had once withered slowly came back to life.

Through his words and his deeds, through his ministry, I rediscovered what Christ once imparted to His apostles: the teaching of love for God and one's neighbor, of compassion, mercy, and the value of every human being. God's love was revealed to me anew—that very Universal Grain, the living truth that transforms the soul.

Deep within me grew the understanding that Christ brought into the world not a code of rituals and dogmas, but that sacred Universal Grain which He entrusted to His apostles. Like sowers in the parable, the apostles carried it into different lands and cultures. In each soil, it sprouted in its own way, producing unique growth: diverse traditions, rites, and confessions. Over time, those differences became more

pronounced—the plants varied in the shape of their leaves, the color of their petals, the height of their stems, and the nature of their fruit. Eventually, they grew so large and so distant from one another that they began to argue, even to fight, insisting that their plant alone was the true one that had sprung from the original Universal Grain. They became fixated on their outward distinctions—on theology and ritual—while losing sight of the shared root that united them all.

The mission of Pastor Burns, as I came to see it, was to remind us of our common foundation—the Universal Grain from which we all have sprung. He never sought to make everyone uniform in form, nor to transplant different flowers into one garden and force them to look the same. On the contrary, he honored diversity, yet again and again, he guided people back to the essence. As if saying to each of us: “Let’s not argue over the shape of our leaves. Let’s look at our roots. Let’s remember that Universal Grain—the love of God that unites us all.”

Meeting Mark Burns felt to me like meeting one of the apostles. In him I saw a faithful heir and a living continuator of their path—a faithful sower bringing into the world that same Universal Grain which Christ once entrusted to His disciples. A grain capable of giving new life, kindling light within the soul, and filling hearts with love.

And another miracle happened for me personally when I finally received the long-awaited answer to my inner question: was this world, torn apart by conflicts and wars, truly doomed to perish in cataclysms?

During that very same ALLATRA TV interview, the host asked Pastor Burns which verse from the Bible he turns to in his most difficult moments—what serves as his source of strength. He named the most familiar, the most seemingly simple, even “elementary,” as he himself put it, verse in the entire New Testament:

“For me, it’s simple: ‘For God so loved the world that He gave His only Son, so that everyone who believes in Him may not perish but have eternal life.’ It sounds almost laughably simple, but in truth it’s the foundation of everything we do... The Lord gave His Son so that I might live. That, for me, is the deepest anchor in Scripture—it lifts me up in the hardest times.”

I had heard that verse before. Yet in that moment—spoken in his voice, after everything I had learned about him, after all the transformation I

had undergone in those past days—it entered my heart as if for the very first time.

In a single instant, in one overwhelming flash, the emptiness that had been expanding inside me was filled with all-pervading light.

“For God so loved ...the world”

The world. Not a group of chosen righteous ones. Not one “right” nation or denomination. But this very world—the whole of it. The very world I had grown disillusioned with.

This very world... God... loved.

He loved it not distantly, not philosophically, but so profoundly, so sacrificially, so unconditionally that He gave for it the most precious thing He had—His Son.

If such a price was paid for this world, if the Creator Himself deemed it worthy of such a sacrifice, then who am I to doubt its value? Who am I to give up and say it is beyond hope?

Our scientific work, our service to humanity, our struggle for human lives suddenly took on a new, higher meaning. I no longer asked, “Why? For whom is all this?” I knew the answer.

Because God so loved the world. And if He loves it that much, if He continues to fight for it, then I have no right to give up. Our efforts are not an attempt to go against His will. They are our participation in it.

It was a revelation of such power that it felt as though a blinding explosion had ignited inside me. In an instant, within the silence of inner darkness, a Universe was born—filled with light and motion. Galaxies, planets, the very breath of life—all emerged from a single spark, from a point where there had once been nothing.

And within this new world lay that same planet—the one where I live, where you live, and where Pastor Mark Burns lives, the man who restored my faith.

References

1. <https://www.liveinternet.ru/users/5996050/post435824919>
2. <https://vimeo.com/148551852> (23:45)
3. <https://www.uscirf.gov/publication/anti-cult-movement-and-religious-regulation-russia-and-former-soviet-union>
4. <https://pravoslavie.ru/81472.html>
5. <https://actfiles.org/the-fourth-reich-who-continues-hitlers-legacy/>
6. <https://valentinechov.livejournal.com/818718.html>
7. <https://actfiles.org/dvorkins-new-reich/>
8. http://www.npar.ru/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/%E2%84%963_2001.pdf
9. https://traditio.wiki/%D0%92%D0%B5%D1%87%D0%BD%D1%8B%D0%B9_%D0%B6%D0%B8%D0%B4%D0%B2%D1%8B%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%B2%D0%BA%D0%B0
10. <https://youtu.be/3ewcFzQiL90?t=107>
11. https://research-calvin-edu.translate.google.com/german-propaganda-archive/responses.htm?x_tr_sl=auto&x_tr_tl=ru&x_tr_hl=ru&x_tr_pto=wapp
12. <https://www.gazeta.ru/social/2013/08/23/5603921.shtml>
13. <https://www.nommeraadio.ee/meedia/pdf/RRS/Adolf%20Hitler%20-%20Collection%20of%20Speeches%20-%201922-1945.pdf>
14. http://www.odinblago.ru/10_voprosov_neznakomcu/
15. <https://research.calvin.edu/german-propaganda-archive/story2.htm>
16. <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/sekty/sektovedenie-totalitarnye-sekty/7>
17. <https://novayagazeta.ru/articles/2023/06/23/on-byl-uveren-chto-znaet-pravilnyi-otvet-media>
18. <https://www.pravmir.ru/aleksandr-dvorkin-v-slovax-kosmicheskaya-liturgiya-vocerkovlennyy-chelovek-intuitivno-chuvstvuet-pod-vox/?ysclid=m3ehw2qged690985183>

19. <https://regnum.ru/article/773905>
20. https://research-calvin-edu.translate.google.com/german-propaganda-archive/responses.htm?x_tr_sl=auto&x_tr_tl=ru&x_tr_hl=ru&x_tr_pto=wapp
21. <https://old.pstgu.ru/news/smi/2012/03/02/35903/>
22. <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/163678?query=%D0%B4%D0%BE%D0%B-F%D1%80%D0%BE%D1%81+%D0%AE%D0%B-B%D0%B8%D1%83%D1%81%D0%B0+%D0%A8%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B9%D1%85%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B0#mode/inspect/page/13/zoom/4>
23. https://research-calvin-edu.translate.google.com/german-propaganda-archive/responses.htm?x_tr_sl=auto&x_tr_tl=ru&x_tr_hl=ru&x_tr_pto=wapp
24. <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/sekty/sektovedenie-totalitarnye-sekty/1>
25. <https://pravoslavie.ru/81472.html>
26. <https://valentincehov.livejournal.com/818718.html>
27. <https://prichod.ru/orthodoxy-everywhere/46326/>
28. <https://www.sova-center.ru/religion/news/authorities/legal-regulation/2016/04/d34374/>
29. <https://actfiles.org/dvorkins-totalitarian-sect-2009-expert-council/>
30. <https://actfiles.org/diveyevo-order-control-center-of-global-anticultism/>
31. <https://meduza.io/feature/2024/04/02/chinovniki-i-biznesmeny-voglave-s-sergeem-kirienko-otdyhayut-i-reshayut-voprosy-v-diveevskom-monastyre>
32. <http://council.gov.ru/structure/persons/295/>
33. <https://actfiles.org/how-dvorkin-tricked-putin-or-how-a-mouse-ruled-a-cat/>
34. http://www.npar.ru/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/%E2%84%963_2001.pdf
35. <https://web.archive.org/web/20191030203201/https://www.about-dvorkin.ru/news.php?id=93329>

36. <https://iskitimeparhia.ru/smi/5380-proti-erey-aleksandr-novopashin-snova-o-lyudoedah.html>
37. <https://radonezh.ru/2024/03/24/snova-o-lyudoedah>
38. <https://ansobor.ru/>
39. https://ansobor.ru/news.php?news_id=5038
40. <https://www.grad-petrov.ru/broadcast/problems-missii-sovremennoj-russkoj/>
41. https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Pestov/sovremennaja-praktika-pravoslavnogo-blagochestija-tom-1-2
42. <https://radonezh.ru/pdf>
43. <https://radonezh.ru/authors/novopashin>
44. <https://radonezh.ru/authors/dvorkin>
45. <https://radonezh.ru/search/node/%D0%B4%D0%B2%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%BD>
46. <https://radonezh.ru/search/node/%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%BE%D0%BF%D0%B0%D1%88%D0%B8%D0%BD>
47. <https://spastv.ru/mitropolit-pavel-iz-pod-aresta-ne-uhodite-iz-lavry-ne-otrekajtes-ot-hrista-molitva-za-geroya-rossiya-proshhaetsya-s-vladlenom-tatarskim/>
48. <https://ovd.info/express-news/2025/09/18/mir-vsem-priznali-nezheletnoy-organizaciy>
49. <https://www.mir-vsem.info/post/%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B4%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B5-%D0%BE%D0%B1%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%89%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5-%D0%BA-%D0%B4%D1%80%D1%83%D0%B7%D1%8C%D1%8F%D0%BC>
50. <https://iriney.ru/main/polemika/rozhdestvenskij-otvet-iz-rossii-na-zarubezhnoe-%C2%ABobrashhenie-k-druzyam%C2%BB.html>
51. https://x.com/agents_media/status/1922336377628192888
52. <https://novayagazeta.eu/articles/2025/05/18/mir-opoznan-kak-vrag>
53. <https://www.pnp.ru/social/deputat-lantratova-dobilis-zapre-ta-deyatelnosti-nemeckogo-fonda-v-rossii.html>

54. <https://tass.ru/obschestvo/23767111>
55. <https://valentincehov.livejournal.com/818718.html>
56. <https://www.liveinternet.ru/users/5996050/post435824919>
57. <https://www.freedommag.org/english/vol29i4/page16.htm>

ABOUT THE BOOK AND THE AUTHOR



I am a professional geophysicist and a participant in the ALLATRA International Public Movement, devoted to research focused on safeguarding our planet and informing society about real global threats. The movement's steadfast commitment to truth has provoked an organized campaign of persecution, which I have personally endured.

This book tells the story of my life and of the remarkable role played in it by Pastor Mark Burns — a Man with a capital “M,” whose heart is filled with love, spiritual strength, and unwavering faith. He is the one who, in the darkest moment of my life, restored my faith.

Elizaveta Khromova